

‘POPULISM’ and ‘ELITISM’

REVILO P. OLIVER

1982

LIBERTY BELL PUBLICATIONS

Copyright 1982
by Revilo Oliver

Additional copies available from:
LIBERTY BELL PUBLICATIONS
Box 21, Reedy, W.Va. 25270 USA

'POPULISM' and 'ELITISM'

Revalo P. Oliver

PART I

'Populist' is a word that was coined to designate a political party formed in 1892 to replace the Greenback Party, which had been a somewhat inept political reaction in 1873 to one of the periodic lootings of the United States by the banking system. 'Populist' was simply a replacement for 'democratic,' a word that had been usurped by one of the major political machines, which was anything but democratic, just as its alternate and ostensible opponent was anything but republican. The new party, which drew much of its inspiration from the writings of Thomas Jefferson, demanded coinage of silver as currency, suppression of nationally-chartered banks, public ownership of railroads and other enterprises that are by their very nature monopolies, and, oddly enough, the self-defeating and disastrous measures that eventually became the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Amendments.

The new party, stimulated by a fresh looting of the economy in 1893, became a threat to the Establishment and was neatly destroyed by a standard political trick, when the principal article of its policy was grabbed by the Democratic Party in 1896 to capture most of the new party's adherents.

Since the dissolution of the Populist Party, the word has been used, often derogatorily, to designate political opinions that are more or less in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson and rely on the supposed will and intelligence of the 'common people,' and it always implies some opposition to the vast engine of corruption and tyranny that the American boobs have been taught to call 'democracy' and to accept, much as a horse accepts a bridle and bit.

Today, Jefferson is somewhat uneasily revered as one of the Founding Fathers, who are generally accorded a kind of perfunctory admiration, while no one is so indiscreet as to observe that if they had foreseen and thought inevitable what their United States became by 1861, they (including Jefferson) would have

torn up Jefferson's Declaration of Independence and urgently called back the British troops.¹

It is no exaggeration to say that most Americans know very little about Jefferson's political philosophy. His biographers waste chapters on such irrelevancies as his preference for informal dress, the furniture of his home, the amount of his debts, and the women whom he did or did not seduce. They commonly pontificate about the impracticality of his policies and apologize for what they call his errors of judgment by saying that he meant well. The harpies of the most diverse political agitations seize upon one or another of his pronouncements which they can twist into an apparent endorsement, by a Founding Father, of their own covert purposes. And American historians, in general, feel obliged to rejoice over what they, by a gross abuse of language, call a Civil War and over the establishment, by outrageous aggression, of an indissoluble Union, cemented by what Calhoun aptly called "the cohesive power of public plunder;" and they measure Jefferson against the ideal of the rotting ochlocracy that replaced the American Republic.

Jefferson was, largely through his own efforts, the best educated of the Founding Fathers. He is the only unquestionable example of an American President who held public office *only* because he felt constrained by duty to do so. Among the founders of the Republic that was forever destroyed in 1861, a few, we may be sure, had their own logically coherent political philosophy, as distinct from opinions about what was expedient at a given time, but only Jefferson expounded his beliefs with an ingenuous candor throughout his career and without the unexpressed reservations that the others, in greater or less degree, felt obliged to make in their own minds. That Jefferson's intellectual honesty was often politically disadvantageous to him cannot be denied, but let us not reckon that as discreditable.

The very bulk of Jefferson's writings, chiefly the 18,000 letters that he preserved for posterity, has made it difficult to obtain an accurate understanding of his thought without the extensive reading of more than forty published volumes of his

1. Candid and objective historians will recognize three eras in our history since Independence: The First Republic (1781-1860), during which the United States *were* governed according to the uneasy compromise embodied in the Constitution; The Second Republic (1865-1932), during which the United States *was* a unified country, established by outrageous aggression and conquest, but considerable portions of the Constitution were salvaged and remained in effect; and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat (1933-?), during which what was left of the Constitution was surreptitiously abrogated and the country progressively prepared for the contemplated merger with the Soviet Union.

writings. If we do not do that, we have to look through the bifocal or trifocal spectacles of a dozen of our contemporaries and try to guess which glasses give the least distortion.

The best single book on Jefferson that I know is the recently published work of Dr. Martin A. Larson, *Jefferson, Magnificent Populist*.² It is virtually the equivalent of a treatise by Jefferson himself in which he sets forth systematically the whole of his thought on every matter of permanent significance. It is a mosaic of excerpts from Jefferson's voluminous writings, carefully chosen, classified by topic, arranged chronologically, and presented with only a minimum of editorial elucidation.

The compilation of what is, in effect, a comprehensive treatise by Jefferson himself required discriminating selection and rigorous compression to reduce it to 375 pages. One need not have read everything or even most of Jefferson's writings to miss some memorable passages, but their substance, I believe, has been preserved in what is included, and we have at last an adequate and fair conspectus of the principles of American democracy as set forth by its founding father.

To this book the reader need bring only such knowledge of history as is, I hope, possessed by everyone who considers himself educated, and such knowledge of the present as is inescapable, if one is not willfully blind. He will derive from it a clear understanding of the intellectual and historical basis of what is now called 'populism,' i.e., democracy in the correct meaning of that word, as distinct from its current use to befuddle weak minds.

THE DISUNITED STATES

The independence of the American colonies was won by a faction of colonists who agreed only on their need to become independent of the British government.³ Having achieved that

2. Not to be confused with the same author's earlier work, *The Essence of Jefferson*, which is inferior on several counts. The new volume is published by Robert B. Luce, Inc., Bethesda, Maryland; xxiv + 390 pages; \$13.50 plus postage, available from Liberty Bell Publications.

3. Let us not forget that, if words are to be used accurately, the United States were created by the *only* civil war that has *thus far* been fought in this country. A civil war is a conflict between factions of the *citizens* of a given state or territory, and in each of the thirteen colonies such a war was waged between the Loyalists, who retained their allegiance to Great Britain and were supported by British troops, and the Revolutionaries, who sought independence and were supported by France. The latter, thanks to the phenomenal stupidity of the French monarchy (which

end, the leaders of the insurgents in the thirteen colonies became the Founding Fathers, but they differed drastically among themselves in what each was determined that independence would mean. They represented a wide gamut of political beliefs that were in fact irreconcilable. Open conflict between the various colonies and within some of them was averted only by temporizing compromises by which each party hoped to gain strength while weakening all others in preparation for a final solution.

The gamut of opinions held by the Founding Fathers may fairly be defined as extending from Thomas Jefferson to Alexander Hamilton. Jefferson had a virtually unlimited faith in 'the people' (by which he meant the part of the total population that corresponded, *mutatis mutandis*, to the *demos* of Athenian democracy) and he regarded Independence as creating thirteen states, allied for the necessary purposes of mutual defense and a common foreign policy, but in their domestic affairs separate nations, in each of which a maximum of personal freedom was guaranteed to each individual citizen and the 'people' would determine by majority vote the domestic policies of their own state, subject only to the preservation of that freedom. Hamilton regarded 'the people,' that is the whole population, as the *belua multorum capitum*, and he was most candid when he echoed the dictum of a hundred political philosophers, including among the Colonists, Benjamin Franklin and Gouverneur Morris: "The people, sir, is a great beast." He regarded Independence as an opportunity to harness and discipline that beast by establishing an aristocracy more cohesive and powerful than that of contemporary Britain⁴

thereby dug its own grave), were victorious and the colonies became independent. The use of the term "Civil War" in propaganda to designate the invasion and conquest of the Southern States in 1861-1865 is *ex post facto* and was artfully devised to conceal from the victims of the public schools the actual dissolution of the American Republic and the acts of aggression that made necessary the Southern War for Independence.

4. It must not be forgotten that, second only to French supplies, troops, and fleets, the success of the Revolution in the thirteen colonies was made possible by the activities of many Englishmen, some who, like Burke, held political beliefs that justified the resistance of the colonists, and many who were just traitors, Whigs who, to procure the fall of the "Tory" government and put their faction in its stead, consistently sabotaged the efforts of George III's ministers to restore order in the disaffected colonies. In Hamilton's America, as is obvious from his famous Alien and Sedition Acts, such persons, from Burke to the traitors who acted as American spies, would have found themselves in prison and so would persons who publicly expressed sympathy for them. Some would have been hanged.

and using its rule to consolidate the several states into an indissolubly united nation that would become a great imperial power, rivalling Great Britain and winning colonies of its own by extensive conquests in South America.

Perhaps midway in the scale of opinion stood George Washington, who had acquired the prestige, but lacked the wish, to found an American monarchy. He regarded the Republic as a noble experiment that should be given a fair trial, but would probably fail in the end. And between Jefferson and Hamilton there stood scores of prominent men who, largely on the basis of their estimates of what was feasible and most conducive to their own interests, hoped to produce some fairly stable compound of fire and water. They ensured the correctness of Washington's prognosis.

It is not my purpose to decide which of the antithetical political philosophies was the more correct, or to apply the hazardous test of historical conjectures about what might have been. I shall here use Dr. Larson's *Jefferson* only to elucidate the doctrine of 'populism' by indicating some of its premises and consequences. I do not pretend to summarize the doctrine itself: it is a coherent and integral whole, and the best summary is Dr. Larson's book.

DEMOCRACY

Democracy, in the correct, Jeffersonian sense of that word, still exerts a great influence over the thinking of our contemporaries, although no example of it in practice can be found in the world today. It is a theory that was first formulated in the democratic states of ancient Greece and has never been entirely forgotten since that time. It engendered the Mediaeval aphorism, *vox populi, vox Dei*, which, so far as I know, was first quoted by Alcuin, who ridicules it; and it reappears in hundreds of modern writers who champion, in one form or another, the concept of majority rule. Although now reduced to a mere theory, it still has charms and evokes some odd tendencies in persons who are intelligent enough to discriminate between democracy and the common practice of running herds of biped cattle through polling places and counting their noses.

'Populists' must remember, first of all, that Jeffersonian democracy was not intended for Timbuktoo, Fiji, or Erewhon. It was designed for the thirteen colonies that had just won their independence—for a specific people in an historically unique situation.

Those colonies came close to being a nation in the primary sense of that word, a *natio*; a large tribe formed of persons related by ancestry and birth, i.e., a racially homogeneous

people. The colonies had been peopled by Englishmen, Scots (including some from Ireland), Germans, Dutch, Scandinavians, and Frenchmen. They were all Aryans and most of them were Nordic. The only racial aliens were the Jews, and at that time there were comparatively few, their depredations were stealthy and almost unnoticed, and their contempt for the stupid Aryans was concealed by their barbaric religion and their habitual whining about "persecution." Among the leaders of the Revolution, only Franklin seems clearly to have apprehended the menace of the covertly hostile *enclave*.

To be sure, there were many aborigines on the continent, but they were relegated to the unsettled territories and formed no part of the American population.⁵ In the colonies, there were numerous Congoids, but they were domestic livestock, and before 1800 very few Americans regarded the animals as dangerous. Even later, many of the most determined opponents of slavery dismissed as emotionally overwrought Jefferson's prescient opposition to slavery, which he had vehemently incorporated in his draft of the Declaration of Independence.⁶

Most of the opposition to slavery came from sentimentalists and religious fanatics, whom Jefferson viewed with scorn. His opposition was on practical grounds.⁷ He recognized the numerous and prolific Congoids as a threat to the racial

5. We may note in passing that Jefferson was wildly optimistic about the Indian's capacity for civilization. As Dr. Larson suggests, he probably drew unwarranted generalizations from a tribe of Indians who were really exceptional, the Cherokees, for whose peculiarities ethnologists have not satisfactorily accounted.

6. For example, Jefferson's bitter enemy, John Quincy Adams, characterized his condemnation of slavery as "frantic." Adams had no illusions about Congoids: "I know of nothing more insolent than a black, when he is not speaking to his master and is not afraid of being beaten. It is not even rare to see negroes treat their masters very ill when they have to do with a weak man." Adams, however, disapproved of slavery on moral grounds and, although he refused to usurp unconstitutional powers when in office, he represented New England, where the iniquity of slavery was keenly perceived when it was no longer possible to profit from it. Near the end of his life, Adams even looked forward to a war of aggression against the South.

7. There was a slight humanitarian element in Jefferson's attitude. The slaves whom the Congoids sold to entrepreneurs (many, but not all, of whom were Jews) were shipped across the Atlantic packed into slave ships in which they had to exist for weeks and even months in conditions to which Aryans (or, at least, Nordics) would not wish to see any mammals subjected. Jefferson had the strong aversion from gratuitous cruelty to sentient mammals that is characteristic of our race and conspicuously absent in other races. Jefferson was also deeply concerned about the moral effects of slavery on many owners.

integrity of the new nation, and he was aware of the potential danger of maintaining in our territory such large and increasing numbers of a biologically inferior and innately savage race. He foresaw that, if emancipated, they would "stain the blood" of our race by copulation with degenerate whites and thus produce unnatural hybrids; it followed, therefore, that "When [a negro] is freed, he is to be removed beyond the reach of mixture." Jefferson thought it impossible to prevent the eventual emancipation of the slaves in one way or another. "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free; *nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government.*"⁸ Disaster could be averted only by exporting the rapidly multiplying anthropoids to Africa or to some nearer and more convenient place, especially the island of Hispaniola after it became available. Jefferson drafted several plans to make that necessary safeguard of American liberty economically feasible, but the tragic blindness of his contemporaries prevented the adoption of any of them.

For Jeffersonian democracy, an independent and racially homogeneous population of Nordics is but the first requisite, for there is great inequality within our race. It is true that Jefferson put into his Declaration of Independence a wild rhetorical flourish, as dramatic as a war-cry, claiming that "all men are created equal." He was not a moron, and cannot have meant anything so absurd as is sometimes supposed. What he meant was that all Englishmen should be equal before the law. He was reacting against the class structure of English society and an aristocracy, of which the greater part had been created by kings who ennobled parvenus, often for the most discreditable services, so that socially and morally worthless individuals were given special privileges because they were descended from men who had, rightly or wrongly, been elevated to the peerage. Jefferson recognized, of course, the biological inequality of all men: "There is a natural aristocracy among men. The grounds for this are virtue⁹ and talents. . . . There is also an artificial

8. The Jefferson Memorial is the most beautiful building in the District of Corruption. It is an architectural gem and, what is more, appropriate, since it is what Jefferson himself would have wanted. It is defaced, however, by the inscription on one of the inner walls of the first part of this sentence and the omission of the words I have italicized. It thus defames Jefferson by implication and was, of course, designed to fool visitors who did not know the complete sentence. There is much to be said for the view that "Liberal intellectuals" are compulsive liars.

9. In Jefferson's time 'virtue' still retained its proper meaning, denoting *manly* excellence, including courage and integrity as shown by both moral and intellectual honesty. It is sad that so useful a word has been perverted by the gabble of Christian propagandists.

aristocracy, founded on wealth and birth, without either virtue or talents; for *with* these, it would belong in the first class."

To ensure the dominance of a natural aristocracy, Jefferson relied on his project of an educational system that would progressively identify the superior men by eliminating at each stage after the very first the innately inferior; a rigorous discrimination would prevent the advancement of men beyond the status for which they were fitted by nature.¹⁰ So vital to the survival of the nation did Jefferson consider this system of selection that he, as in his famous foundation of the University of Virginia, believed a strictly secular and cultural education, based on the Classics, history, and science, and excluding all superstitions, should be financed and maintained by taxation. The English language contains so few words of reprobation and invective that I cannot imagine what Jefferson would have said; had he foreseen the moral and mental rot that made possible the capture of the public schools by the vast gang of swindlers, saboteurs, and dolts that has made of those schools a terrible machine for inculcating the most bizarre and noxious superstitions and deforming the minds of children, with what amounts to infantile paralysis of the cerebrum.

RELIGION

The education that Jefferson championed was to be exclusively rational and secular, and, indeed, no other form of public education would be possible in a true democracy.¹¹ That

10. Needless to say, Jefferson was thinking of *public* education, and did not attempt to prescribe what should be done in Christian and other private schools, which was properly to be determined by the persons who financed them. Such schools, however, were not to be subsidized by the public, either directly or indirectly (through tax exemptions), and Jefferson probably assumed that their products would be inferior in the measure that they departed from *factual* education and objective discrimination, either by inculcating superstitions or by coddling the unfit.

11. The use of religious rites to promote national unity, which I mentioned in my long article in *The Liberty Bell* for May 1982, was innocuous and feasible in a democracy so long as the religion remained "pagan." In the history of our race, the first to advocate plausibly the use of religion to consolidate a tyranny (a "righteous" one, of course) was Plato, who wanted legislation to compel belief in the gods he imagined and to suppress all dissent by executing atheists (*Nomoi*, 909a), i.e., men too intelligent to believe his revelations and insufficiently hypocritical to feign belief. Plato's mastery of Greek style and his "idealism," which the late Professor Ben E. Perry described as "intellectual masturbation," win him great prestige among educated persons whose imaginations outrun their common sense. It is significant, therefore, that Jefferson regarded Plato as "one of the . . . sophists," took no stock in his "whimsie" and mysticism,"

should be obvious, but the intensive lying that has gone on for generations now requires us to stress the obvious.

We may note *obiter* that Jefferson was a deist in the manner of Graeco-Roman Stoics. He believed, on the basis of the evidence available to him, that the most reasonable explanation of natural phenomena required an inference that the universe had been designed and created by a supernatural Fabricator, who was also the author of the moral laws that must be observed by civilized and stable societies. In the rudimentary state of scientific knowledge in his time, that view was certainly plausible and not improbable.¹²

The important point is that Jefferson was not a Christian. He regarded Christianity as simply a form of devil-worship, since it venerated the Jews' ferocious god, "a Being of terrific character, cruel, vindictive, and unjust." That celestial monster, which a "cruel, remorseless, and blood-thirsty race" had created in its own image, made the Christians' holy book, which details with admiration his appalling criminal record, subversive of all civilized morality.¹³ That made all of the numerous sects that

and saw that the Platonic writings had been preserved by theologians for the subtle irrationality that could give an intellectual coloring to irrational fantasies. His opinion of Plato was substantially in agreement with the learned Edgar Lucas White in his *Why Rome Fell* (New York, 1927).

12. The state of the physical sciences in Jefferson's day is shown by the honor paid to his great friend, Priestly, for such "epochal discoveries" as "dephlogisticated air" (oxygen) and "marine acid air" (hydrogen chloride). The biological sciences were virtually unborn, although the genius of Lord Monboddo enabled him to anticipate some essentials of biological evolution and to take a rational view of human nature and society. So far as I can recall offhand, Jefferson never mentioned Lord Monboddo's elementary anthropology, but I cannot now take time to peruse the forty volumes, and I may be mistaken.

13. Jefferson may not have distinguished clearly between personal and collective morality. Some observers, e.g., Jack Bays, in a leaflet reprinted in *The Truth Seeker*, April 1982, believe that reading the Bible, like viewing scenes of violence and depravity on television, incites many impressionable individuals to crimes such as rape, murder, and robbery. Bays amplified the well-known opinion of Mark Twain, who, in his *Letters from Earth*, was certain that the minds of children, at least, are corrupted and perverted by reading the Bible, with its demoralizing stories of atrocious crimes perpetrated with the approval and collaboration of the Christians' supposedly omnipotent god. As Jefferson repeatedly observed, the Jews have no conception of ethics and believe that by sexually mutilating their male children and by observing grotesque taboos, such as abstaining from certain kinds of food and defecating and urinating in the ways Yahweh likes to watch, they conciliated that capricious and blood-thirsty god, who thus became their supernatural accomplice and

were hawking salvation to the ignorant almost equally pernicious.¹⁴ Jefferson hoped that so immoral a superstition would be obliterated by the increase of knowledge and education; he was once even so optimistic that he predicted that the "young men now living in the United States" would reject every form of Christianity except the Unitarian cult, which was a step in the right direction.

In the meantime, Jefferson relied on the frantic competition between the numerous corporations in the holiness business to

helped them delude, swindle, plunder, and slaughter civilized peoples. Mark Twain was particularly impressed by the episode of the Midianites, who were guilty of having property the Jews wanted. The horde of ferocious bandits poured into Midia in northern Arabia and, with the help of the Big Jew in the sky, defeated the Midianite army. Then they systematically butchered all the men, butchered all the women, butchered all the male children, and then rounded up the female children, most of them impubertate, and, after verifying their virginity, sold them into slavery in foreign brothels. Unlike Christians, Mark Twain felt compassion for 32,000 Arab virgins: "Their naked privacies were probed, to make sure they still possessed the hymen unruptured; after this humiliation, they were sent away from the land that had been their home, to be sold into slavery, the worst of slaveries and the shamefulest, the slavery of prostitution." After completing this phase of their holy work, the Jews looted and burned the Midianite cities and went home, loaded with spoil and driving the mobile part of their booty, 675,000 sheep, 72,000 cattle, and 61,000 asses; and as they divided up the loot, they exulted in their righteousness, which paid off so handsomely after giving them so much fun. And they had Yahweh's promise that if they continued to observe his nasty taboos, he would help them subjugate all the other races of the world, as he is obviously doing in Lebanon today, having made their American bondsmen finance them and supply them with weapons.

For a concise but sweeping indictment of Christianity, see the two articles by Ralph Perier in *The Liberty Bell* for August and November 1980 (reprints are available from Liberty Bell Publications). For a profound and virtually encyclopaedic study of the effect of Christianity on the whole of our civilization, see the magisterial work of William Gayley Simpson, *Which Way, Western Man?* (available from Liberty Bell Publications). I am here interested only in elucidating the fundamentals of Jeffersonian democracy.

14. Jefferson made a certain exception in favor of the Unitarians, among whom deists could find shelter at the cost of a little hypocrisy. He especially detested the Calvinist cults for their conception of their god as a sadistic and insane beast that created human beings whom he *destined* for damnation so that he could enjoy torturing them forever. It may be regarded as certain that "God-fearing" Christians, living in perpetual terror of that celestial monster, developed psychotic conditions that approximate insanity. It should be noted that there was a high concentration of Calvinists in New England, the region that so balefully influenced all the subsequent history of the United States.

neutralize the Christian menace to civilization in the United States, since all the factions knew that if any one of them attained political power, all the rest would be among the first to suffer from the pious Christian's itch to persecute, torture, and kill.¹⁵ All beliefs about the supernatural must therefore be considered strictly private and personal matters, the business of no one except the individual who holds an opinion about the unknowable that he may or may not wish to disclose to others. A firm insistence on that principle, Jefferson believed, would prevent the professional holy men from using gangs of fanatics to acquire political influence and power.

Jefferson did have a certain respect for the Jesus mentioned in the "New Testament," regarding him a Jew who made a manly effort to mitigate the savagery and criminal instincts of the race into which he was born, and to replace their ferocity with an ethical system. *That* Jesus, he thought, could be used to counteract Christianity, which was really a "counter-religion made up of the *deliria* of crazy imaginations," and to that end Jefferson tried to make a coherent and plausible story of the inconsistent tales in the Christian gospels that are called synoptic. He cut and pieced together from the Greek text the parts of those stories that seemed to him edifying and believable, adding the standard Latin, English, and French translations to form a sylloge, a compendium that could make Christianity innocuous.¹⁶ To the doctrine of Jesus, thus purged

15. The holy men of the various sects could gang up to suppress cults that competed with all of them. They, for example, bullied the legislature of New York into persecution of the Shakers, an act which Jefferson vigorously protested, perceiving the fatal consequences of permitting the salvation-peddlers to influence government.

16. It was to form "an octavo of forty-six pages," but was not published in Jefferson's lifetime. It was first printed, so far as I know, in 1904 by the U. S. Government Printing Office for distribution by Congressmen, who were not then so cowed as they now are by the ranting of holy demagogues, and was first published in Volume XX of the *Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Washington, D.C., 1905). The part in English was recently reproduced as *An American Christian Bible* (Rochester, Wash., 1982), followed by an essay by Eric Holden, "A New Declaration of Independence," in which the author tries to revive a Jeffersonian deism and a Jeffersonian democracy. He sharpens Jefferson's dislike of the professional mystery-mongers and identifies, more clearly than did Jefferson, the activity and purposes of the Jewish Nation: "For three thousand years, it has been a nation of spies and saboteurs, waging undeclared war on all nations with fixed locations. Citizenship in the Nomadic Jewish Nation is *prima facie* evidence that the individual is an active spy and/or saboteur." — Jefferson, on the basis of his reconstruction of the character of the Jesus of the "New Testament," sometimes rather

of absurdities and cruelty, he attributed a "sublime morality," without himself espousing it: "I am a Materialist; he [Jesus] takes the side of Spiritualism." Jefferson admired "the purity and sublimity" of the Jewish reformer's "moral precepts," but was aware that they contained "Eastern hyperbolism" and, while elevating reading, could not be taken literally as a practical social system.¹⁷ That had to be based on a realistic understanding of human nature and rational regulation of it.

In Jefferson's times, the Jews could entrust the work of promoting dissension, civil strife, and social fragmentation to the Christian dervishes, whose professional interests required them to keep their followers excited with hatred of the wickedness of their competitors and of all others who impeded the infliction of a tyranny they would call a theocracy, since a competent theologian is like a ventriloquist: he can make his god say whatever he wants. No democracy, indeed, no stable society could survive such disruptive agitation. Pending the decline and eventual extinction of the Christian plague, for which Jefferson hoped, the best that could be done was strictly to exclude the dervishes from political power, and in the meantime to endure "a swarm of insects, whose buzz is more disquieting than their bite."

Needless to say, no democracy could tolerate such subversive disingenuously described himself as a "true Christian," meaning that he was a deist who emphatically repudiated the bloody god of the Jews and Christians.

17. Jefferson included in his sylloge the sermon that Perier, in the articles mentioned above, called the Drivel on the Mount, which, if taken seriously, would make impossible an organized society of any kind. He was particularly concerned to exclude, in addition to talk about miracles and the like, such passages as *Luke* 19.27. That poses a perplexing question. It is not remarkable that most Christian clergymen, like so many others, have been taken in by the Jews' "Holocaust" hoax, which the Jews are now enforcing by pseudo-legal terrorism, since they consider it especially useful for keeping their Aryan serfs stultified and content, but what is astonishing is that those clergymen, who claim to have read their "New Testament" and to believe it, disapprove of the supposed execution of six million Jews. It is undeniable that those Jews, whether they believed their outlandish religion or were atheists, "would not that" Jesus "should reign over them." And since Christians claim that their Jesus, after delivering his commandment, flew up to a place in the sky whence he watches everything that happens on earth; he could have enjoyed watching the death-agonies from his vantage point in the welkin as much as when he was on earth and gave the order, "bring them hither, and slay them before me." It is really remarkable that, so far as I know, no one of the innumerable holy men who are jostling for public attention has thought of praising the Germans for the obedience to Jesus that is reported in the Jews' fiction. That would not only prove his faith in the "inerrancy" of his holy book, but would surely gain him celebrity and a large following.

activity as that of the rabble-rousers who are currently working the "Moral Majority" racket and not only fleece the boobs of at least \$500,000,000 each year, but also serve as the avowed agents of the Jews' bandit-state in Palestine.¹⁸

SOCIETY

A racially homogeneous population and honestly secular government are not enough for a Jeffersonian democracy. It contemplates and requires a population that is predominantly agrarian, dispersed throughout the country on farms and in very small towns. Such was the population in Jefferson's time, and such he assumed or hoped it would always be. He anticipated the findings of modern biological research, which has conclusively shown that all mammals become neurotic and unstable when crowded together, and that the larger the mammals the greater the derangement that is caused by forced proximity to too many of their own kind, even though they are abundantly supplied with food and protected from every form of molestation.

Men, Jefferson believed, inevitably degenerate when crowded together in large cities and deprived of both the freedom of the countryside and direct contact with nature. In large cities, a majority of the population lives in an artificial environment that is unnatural and biologically dehumanizing, becoming a *canaille*, a "swinish multitude." It was only logical for the revolutionary attack on the United States to use financial manipulations since 1918 to deplete the agrarian part of our population and to use open political pressures as soon as a general sabotage of the economy had put securely into power the masters of the loathsome creature called Franklin Roosevelt. Thus was the agrarian part of the population reduced from

18. For a strictly objective and impartial survey of the anti-American work of these despicable shysters, see the article, "The Religious Right and Zionism," by Dr. Ruth W. Mouly in *The Humanist* for May-June 1982. She quotes a professedly non-Jewish journalist as saying, "As a gentile American, as a Christian who considers loyalty to God above all human commitments, if the choice ever comes between loyalty to an American government and loyalty to Israel, I have no choice. I must stand by Israel." Some people criticize the Germans adversely for having interned such traitors in concentration camps in a time of crisis! Dr. Mouly concludes that "The potential of the Religious Right to shape America's Middle East policy is frightening." She does not note the impudence of the rabble-rousers' claim to be "conservative," but she does quote a boast by the notorious assassin, murderer, and terrorist, Menachem Begin, "We have many friends, we have the Christians of America." He was probably right; the exceptions to his generalization are politically negligible.

a majority to a tiny minority in less than sixty years.¹⁹

When a population becomes predominantly urban, democracy becomes impossible. Aryans are probably less able to tolerate crowding than other races, and if you wish to restore a democracy, you will have either to disperse the masses of our large cities or disenfranchise them, and it will not be easy to do either in a country that is already fantastically overpopulated. The elimination of other races might suffice to reduce the terrible surplus of numbers, but even that would leave our cities monstrously overgrown. If reduction of the urban cancers involves the sacrifice of some luxuries—and I cannot undertake to conjecture what sacrifices, if any, would be necessary—that is simply the price that must be paid for a healthy and viable society.

I need not add that a democratic government is subject to a natural limitation of size. To ignore that fact is to move into the realm of fairy tales, which commonly depict giants that fascinate children, who do not know that, as a matter of physiological fact, such giants would be unable to move at all. The Federal government would have to be reduced to its original function, that of providing a consistent foreign policy and adequate national defense and of arbitrating between the states, which are otherwise domestically independent.

Jefferson predicted with absolute accuracy that "If this vast country [east of the Mississippi] is brought under a single government, it will be one of the most extensive corruption." He also predicted, "When all government . . . shall be drawn to Washington as the center of power, it . . . will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated." But "as oppressive" was the limit of his foresight. In his most gloomy forebodings, he could not imagine the tyranny of organized crime under which the spiritless and spineless

19. According to the *American Agricultural News*, 22 September 1981, the Federal government in March of that year held 11% of the debts of the remaining farmers, and of this, about 50% was already in default. The periodical suggests that when the Federal government forecloses, it will kick off the former owners and place on the farms credulous young men, who will be so enslaved by debt they will, in effect, work without pay for five years or so, when they can be thrown off and replaced with a fresh lot of serfs. They will, of course, be managed by overseers from Washington while they work. The present interest rates make it impossible for farmers now in debt to the Federal Reserve to survive; their land will probably be taken by the large corporations, many or most of them now owned by Japanese and other foreigners, that have been replacing independent farmers for years, and it will probably be necessary to put white Americans in labor gangs to work properties on which Orientals and mongrels from Mexico would be less efficient.

Americans now live as they ovinely endure a taxation five thousand times greater, in proportion to income, than the taxation that stirred their ancestors to revolt in 1776.

The District of Corruption is now what Americans have made it. Men and women who still dream that there may be some hope in "their" Congress should read Louis Hurst's *The Sweetest Club in the World* (Englewood, N.J., 1982). As manager of the Senate's exclusive restaurant for many years, Mr. Hurst was able to observe our august Solons while they frolicked and intrigued with their fellows. If you want to influence legislation, don't waste twenty cents on a letter to the waste-baskets of one of "your" Senator's secretaries: it will take at least \$10,000 to get his attention. The cost of his vote will depend, naturally, on what other bids he receives: \$400,000 is not uncommon.²⁰

Although we have no comparable book on the House of Representatives, we may be sure that its members, being so much more numerous, must lead more austere lives and be content with smaller bribes. It is also likely that they, being more penurious, take care to remain sober enough to carry their fees home with them, rather than risk leaving the bag on the luncheon table when they stagger away in an alcoholic fog, as the more merry Senators sometimes do.

Americans who read Mr. Hurst's book or some other description of the normal functioning of the government they have brought upon themselves will probably complain fretfully for several minutes before they forget about it. They should remember the motto of the gentleman who writes under the name "General R. Never": it could have been Jefferson's. "A people deserve whatever they permit."

20. Another measure of the Senate is provided by an incident reported in the *Spotlight*, 26 December 1981. Many Americans, fondly imagining that they were represented in Washington, wrote to their Senators to protest the use of American resources to enable the Jews in Israel to follow the Mosaic custom and kill the inhabitants of territory in the Middle East that God's Race was planning to seize. Seventy-two of the Senators fingered their trusting constituents to the Jewish terrorist organizations that exercise surveillance over *goyim* who become restive. Whether those Senators betrayed their constituents as a courtesy to their bosses or, as an unverifiable rumor has it, were paid five dollars for each letter turned over to the Jews, is necessarily uncertain. What is remarkable is that some Senators were sufficiently honorable to refuse to curry favor or earn pin money by such treachery. — I am reminded of an article that appeared, if I remember correctly, in the last years of Mencken's editorship of the *American Mercury*. The author had been for many years a member of the legislature of one of the plains states in the Middle West. He said that he was quite willing to believe that there were legislators who did not take bribes; he, however, had never known one.

ECONOMICS

One is apt to be astonished by the severity of Jefferson's strictures on the English. They remind me, *mutatis mutandis*, of Lord Byron, of whom it has been said that he was never more characteristically English than when he was denouncing his compatriots. Like Byron, Jefferson resented with Anglo-Saxon vehemence certain aspects of contemporary English conduct, and if you examine his utterances with care, you will find that, with the possible exception of certain forms of political corruption, his Anglophobia was focused on just one institution: the Bank of England. In his opinion, it set the precedent, and was the model, for the greatest of all swindles, the emission of paper currency and the creation of a funded national debt.²¹

Professional economists have long done for the basic questions of monetary systems what Jefferson accused Hamilton of doing: "In order that he might have the absolute government of his [financial] machine, he determined to complicate it so that neither the President nor the Congress should be able to understand it, or to control him. He succeeded in doing this, not only beyond their reach, but so that he at length could not unravel it himself." Economic jargon is now used to obfuscate what has been aptly called the legalized crime of banking.

21. The history of monetary swindles is long and complex, and obviously lies far beyond the scope of this article. I shall nevertheless mention a little-known detail that may be of special interest to the readers of this periodical. The question of theft on a grand scale by government was, I believe, first raised by the learned Jesuit, Juan de Mariana, in his essay "*De monetæ mutatione*," which was one of his *Tractatūs VII*, published at Cologne in 1609. Since the Duke of Lerma was outraged by the libellous suggestion that he could be so dishonest as to do what he was actually doing, Mariana spent many years in the dungeons of the Inquisition, from which he emerged only as an old and broken man. (Incidentally, Lerma, who impoverished Spain and enriched himself by financial looting on a then unprecedented scale, was a very pious Christian and eventually became a Cardinal.) Mariana's younger friend, who became his research assistant when his eyesight began to fail, was the noted Spanish satirist, Quevedo, who came close to identifying international finance as a prime cause of contemporary disasters. In his *Hora de todos*, he describes a conspiracy between the Jews, the eternal enemies of the nations in which they have lodged themselves, and the crooks who control the financial policies of those nations. — The revolt of the American colonies was primarily caused by British manipulation of their currencies for the benefit of the Bank of England. The crucial importance of this factor was, I believe, first isolated by the American economist, Alexander Del Mar, in his *History of Money in America* (London, 1899; reprinted Hawthorne, Calif., 1966).

Let us horrify the professional by following Jefferson in reducing the problem to its simplest terms and considering them from the standpoint of plain common sense. The first stage in banking, as devised by the Jewish goldsmiths of the late Middle Ages, is quite simple. The banker accepts and promises to guard deposits of real money (i.e., gold and silver) and issues receipts (bank notes) for the deposit. He then supplements his capital (whatever that may be) by lending at usury a large part of the deposits he has received; in other words, he embezzles them, counting, as do most embezzlers, on being able to recoup what he has taken before it is demanded of him and to pocket the profit he has made by use of it. If he has calculated correctly the percentage of his depositors who will ask for their money at a given time in the future and estimated correctly the likelihood that borrowers will repay at the stated times, he waxes fat on the usury and prospers; if he has miscalculated, than he, like any other embezzler whose plans have gone wrong, becomes insolvent and the loss falls on the individuals who trusted the crook with their money.

Since paper receipts are more convenient to handle and send to others than specie, they come to be used in place of the real money, which is therefore left in the hands of the banker, who, it is assumed, will deliver the money whenever his receipt is presented to him. This suggests to him a highly profitable fraud: he issues receipts for money that he does not have in his possession and never had, and by lending these spurious receipts, he collects usury on money that exists only in his imagination. His greed almost invariably leads him to rash optimism and his eventual bankruptcy becomes the more spectacular, although he has usually had the prudence to place his ill-gotten gains in a safer place than his own bank and so can laugh at the indignation of the victims of his swindle.

This second stage represents the normal operation of the banking system during the First Republic, and naturally, aided by the typically American "get-rich-quick" mania, produced the normal "business cycle" of boom and bust, prosperity and recession, that bedeviled the United States from the first.

The third stage was attained when a gang of bankers formed the Bank of England, lent to the British government fictitious receipts for non-existent deposits, and arranged to collect usury in perpetuity by "funding" the national debt thus created. This was in some way convenient for its victims, the nation's tax-payers,²² but it gave to the bank the backing of the nation's

22. This was a minor factor, no doubt, but during the Nineteenth Century "Consols" (i.e., "consolidated annuities," government bonds that bore no date of maturity) were an eminently safe investment for Englishmen who

credit, i.e., its taxing power, which was thus made to guarantee the bank's notes as an unquestioned substitute for real money. As Jefferson saw, "funding is but swindling futurity on a large scale." And even if the paper represents real money, all that can be lent to a government is what has been borrowed from the people, who are thus expected to repay the bankers what the bankers have borrowed from them, and "to fill up the measure of blessing, instead of paying, they [the bankers] receive interest on what they owe from those to whom they owe." Could anything be more preposterous?

Two attempts to found an American analogue of the Bank of England were short-lived, and it was probably Jefferson's influence that put an end to both of them, but much the same result was obtained when national banks were authorized to create fictitious money secured by governmental bonds they had purchased with their chits in the first place, and on which they were accordingly paid interest. Thus was the national debt instituted as a permanent swindle and, of course, wars and "emergencies" were devised to increase it as rapidly as was thought feasible. Highly profitable panics, as "recessions" were once called, were arranged under this system, but it was eventually improved.

In 1913, the Jews and their assistant conspirators put over the Federal Reserve and the Income Tax in preparation for the First World War, which had been scheduled for the following year. The boobs, of course, wagged their tails with do-gooding enthusiasm as they stuck their heads in both nooses.

The identity of the real owners of the Federal Reserve is an official and closely guarded secret. I have seen what purports to be a list of the eight owners: seven nests of Jews (Rothschilds, Warburgs, etc.) and, last and perhaps least, the Rockefellers. I have no means of knowing whether this list represents a leak of secret information or a reasoned deduction from fragmentary evidence or a surmise based on the system's operations. One can only say that the list is plausible: God's People will not have overlooked so potent a means of herding the livestock on their

had relatively small sums to invest or preferred security to a higher rate of return. In this country, government bonds were regarded as a safe investment until the great War Criminal began his usurpation by repudiating the solemn pledge to redeem them in real money and proceeded further to swindle the investors by systematically inflating the currency and making them pay taxes on their losses. The devaluation of the currency naturally enriched the gang that planned it and, notably, Roosevelt's supervisor, the Jew Baruch, who, according to Col. Curtis Dall in his *F.D.R.*, acquired seven sixteenths of all the silver in the whole world in anticipation of the great act of piracy and thus obtained a profit of 80% in a few weeks. Yahweh created the sheep to be fleeced by the Righteous, didn't he?

North American plantation.²³

The accomplishments of the Federal Reserve are obvious to everyone. When herds of crazed boobs were stampeded into Europe in a Holy War in 1917, the primary purpose was to help in the systematic destruction of Western civilization, but an incidental benefit was the vast increase in the national debt, thus permitting the Federal Reserve to print bundles of intrinsically worthless paper on which the tax-paying boobs were condemned to pay interest in perpetuity. In 1920, a neat "recession" was ordered, primarily to impoverish the agrarian part of our population, while other sectors of the economy were steered into a delirium of inflation in preparation for the panic and "depression" which the Federal Reserve's monopoly of the banking system enabled it to make total, thus inducing the Revolution of 1933 so cleverly that the dumb brutes did not even suspect what was being done to them.

During this period, although the nation was obviously bankrupt, since the fraudulent currency could never have been redeemed for the value printed on it, the American serfs were still permitted to have money if they wanted it: so long as only a few did so, they could exchange the paper for gold and silver. The first act of the Revolutionary régime was to steal all the gold in the country (except a few bits of jewelry that the slaves were permitted to retain), and this outrage did not evoke from the American dolts even so much protest as sheep commonly utter when they are fleeced. The Americans were permitted to have silver for small change until a few years ago, when the last bits of money were taken from the uncomprehending creatures, who, with ovine docility, were content to use in place of money only the paper trash printed by the great counterfeiting ring called the Federal Reserve, which now has them by the neck and will inflate them into undisguised slavery when it is ready for the real crash, which will, no doubt, bring a total prostration, now that the residue which was left in 1930 has been entirely consumed. The Americans will doubtless become as excited and frantic as the jackrabbits on a Texas ranch when

23. Needless to say, many bankers who are caught in the system are personally honest, and that includes some persons who have attained a fairly high rank in the Federal Reserve itself. The late Malcolm Bryan, who grew up in the town in which I now live and is remembered as a man of integrity, became President of the branch of the Federal Reserve in Atlanta, Georgia, and, according to the *California Mining Journal*, September 1961, told the Senate Finance Committee, "If a policy of active or permissive inflation is to be a fact, then we can save the shreds of our self-respect only by announcing the policy We should have the decency to say to the money saver, 'Hold still, little fish; all we intend to do is to gut you.' "

the ranchers begin one of their jackrabbit-drives.²⁴

Jefferson, of course, could not have foreseen what the banking swindles have done to us, but he did foresee that the financial manipulations made possible by paper currency and a fraudulent national debt could end only in the destruction of the nation. He urged again and again the simple honesty from which professional economists so loudly dissuade us.

The only currency permitted in a democracy must be real money, i.e., a metallic currency made of the precious metals that have an intrinsic value. He called repeatedly for "the suppression of all paper circulation during peace." And he gave a conclusive refutation of all schemes of a "managed currency," including some recent proposals by hopefuls who like to imagine a Congress that could be trusted to do more than joyfully adopt a new method of looting. Jefferson did no more than state an indisputable historical truth when he said of paper currency that "it is liable to be abused, has been, is, and forever will be abused, in every country in which it is permitted." A

24. Americans who are interested may obtain a preview of their proximate future from Jean Raspail's *The Camp of the Saints* (New York, 1975; paperback reprint, London, s.a. [1980?]) Preparations to hasten that future began with the large-scale importation of "Mongoloids" from southeast Asia, of whom at least half, according to an intelligence officer who served in Vietnam throughout the phony "war" there, are seasoned killers from the Viet-Cong. This was followed by the intensive importation of savages from Haiti and Cuba and of mongrels (chiefly mestizos and sambos) from Mexico; the influx continues on a large scale, with only token efforts to control it by an Immigration Service that Washington prevents from acting effectively. What is planned has long been obvious, but I was interested in learning from the *National Vanguard* (January 1982) that one of the most authoritative and expensive business-advisory services (\$775.00 per annum) has advised its subscribers that uncontrolled killing, raping, burning, and looting of the white population by its racial enemies will begin in the summer of 1983 as the opening of a "long-term trend of continuing non-white [i.e., anti-white] violence and destruction." Prudent business men are advised to remove their homes and, if possible, their businesses to regions which the Federal government has not yet saturated with niggers and "Hispanics" (the euphemism which is currently applied to creatures who have nothing Spanish about them except some tincture of blood from the Spanish who conquered the aborigines in Central and South America and copulated with the female natives, and some ability to speak a low and corrupt dialect of Spanish). It is taken for granted, of course, that the only thing for the white rabbits to do is to run, if they have a chance, and to try to find a thicket in which to hide until the governmental beaters drive them out. Although the business-advisory service, if correctly reported by the *National Vanguard*, does not say so, there are, no doubt, a few Americans who can think of an alternative to running like jackrabbits, but they are wicked "racists" and "neo-Nazis" and ought to be crucified, shouldn't they?

paper currency is simply an invitation to swindlers and to counterfeiters, both in and out of government, an invitation that no rational man could expect them to refuse. The only honest currency is real money, the precious metals that have an intrinsic, universal, and, for all practical purposes, fixed value, against which the prices of commodities will fluctuate through the unimpeded operation of the law of supply and demand.

A corollary of honest money is that there must be no national debt, no funded debt of any governmental body. Expenses must be met by taxation, not dishonestly imposed on our offspring by governmental borrowing of fictitious money on which they will pay usury forever. The only exception to constant solvency is for a war, which is an enterprise of the whole nation that will be defended or expanded by it. The extraordinary expenses of the war are to be met by the emission of a paper currency that is to be redeemed in specie at a stated time from the revenue of taxes concurrently imposed to provide for the redemption. So long as the citizens are confident of an eventual victory, the paper currency will circulate at par, given the guarantee of its redemption. In an extreme emergency, such as greatly prolonged war or a national defeat, the paper currency could bear interest, but the interest would eventually be paid to the citizen holding the note, who would regard it as a good investment. There would be no borrowing of worthless paper from bankers for the privilege of paying them interest on what they never really lent.

Such was the monetary policy of Jefferson, who thought that governments should be as honest as individuals were supposed to be so long as we had a recognized system of morality.

Honesty, to be sure, is extremely unpopular these days, and honest money would make it necessary to forego the blessings of a "prosperity" by a continued inflation, which enables clever scoundrels, even outside banking circles, to profit from the stupidity of their exploited compatriots. But if you want a stable democracy, you must be prepared to take it with its disadvantages.

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

A political philosophy (often called "political science" by practitioners who are not averse from verbal trickery) must deal with contemporary realities. If it does not, if it is charged with "ideals," it is merely a variety of romantic fiction, although it may not be recognized as such.

If we are to estimate Jefferson's rank as a political philosopher, certain questions obviously pose themselves. I shall state them without attempting to answer them.

1. Did he, a wealthy landowner in whose presence his inferiors were generally on their good behavior, correctly estimate the character of the effective majority of the population of the United States in his time? Or did he have generous illusions about that majority?

2. There is an alternative to that question, viz.: Did he correctly estimate the majority in the states outside New England, so that the Constitution could have been preserved, had the New England states seceded from the Union at the time of the Hartford Convention, instead of deciding to remain in the Union so that they could continue to exploit the other states?

3. If Jefferson did not mistake the character of the majority on which he relied, some other explanation of the failure of democracy must be found. For example, did the innumerable banking swindles that he deplored fatally mislead a population intoxicated with "get-rich-quick" hootch?

4. Another example: Was the really fatal flaw the failure to keep the Christians under control? The First Republic was destroyed by the frenzied hate-mongering of the Abolitionists. A rational opposition to slavery in the United States could be based only on racial grounds and, as Jefferson so often said, implied the deportation of the unassimilable anthropoids from American soil.²⁵ The scurvy crew of rabble-rousers that plagued the northern states, until they created an opportunity for the greed of financial looters and the Jews' hatred of our race in the invasion of the South they provoked, were only a fanatical and crazed riff-raff. They were a product of the epidemic of religious mania that spread through the country in the 1830s.²⁶

25. As everyone knows, Abraham Lincoln, who seems to have had a mystic admiration for "the Union," was not a Christian and could therefore see the implications of an emancipation of the blacks, whom he intended to export to Central America to save the expense of shipping them back to Africa. That, of course, was one reason why he was assassinated as soon as his usefulness was ended. Even the great Liberal and opponent of slavery, Lord Acton, recognized that whenever two incompatible races are present in the same territory, democracy is possible only by the enslavement of one of them. See his *Essays on Freedom and Power* (London, 1956), especially his "Political Causes of the American Revolution," first published in May 1861, before the invasion of the South began. He saw, however, that the Republic established by the Constitution had ended in total failure. Noteworthy is his characterization of the moral purpose professed by politicians opposed to slavery: "It adorned cupidity with the appearance of philanthropy."

26. See Gilbert Hobbs Barnes, *The Antislavery Impulse, 1830-1844* (New York, 1933), which clearly shows that the Abolitionists were merely a

They pretended that their god, the supposed author of their Bible, had forbidden slavery; that was a lie, a brazen lie, and, if they had read their holy book, they knew it; but all witch-doctors know the technique of concealing mendacity and effrontery by shaking their fetishes faster and yelling louder. The Abolitionists' righteousness was, as we should expect, the product of minds festering with envy and malice and a blood-lust that was at least latent in all of them.²⁷ They were inspired by the success of the great "civil rights" movement in Haiti,²⁸ and they loved their "black brothers" as instruments

specialized group of the howling dervishes whose evangelical rant became a national affliction. See also Dwight Lowell Dumond, *Antislavery Origins of the Civil War in the United States* (London, 1939), and Hazel Catherine Wolf, *On Freedom's Altar, the Martyr-Complex in the Abolition Movement* (Madison, Wis., 1952). A few of the rabble-rousers, notably the crazed William Lloyd Garrison, were honest enough to admit that the Bible contained nothing that could be interpreted as a deprecation of slavery.

27. Few, of course, had the courage of the famous homicidal maniac, John Brown, who is now much admired for his blood-thirsty ferocity, but one has to consider objectively only so relatively mild a specimen as Julia Ward Howe to perceive the inner motivation of the agitator's "righteousness." She is the author of the words of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," which she adapted, ironically enough, to music by a Southern composer who has been variously identified. It is one of the most terrible songs ever sung. It is a hymn to the bloody Yahweh of the "Old Testament," and it is inspired by a joyous anticipation of slaughter such as he supposedly inflicted on the Midianites and all other civilized peoples who had property that his pet bandits coveted. "Kill, O Yahweh, kill!" was the exultant cry of Mrs. Howe's heart, "kill those white women who are lolling in elegant ease with slaves to attend them while I have to be content with hired servants, who are both expensive and likely to become cantankerous or insolent. Kill those white women who are courted by gallant and chivalrous gentlemen while I have to marry some money-grubbing merchant or hypocritically austere holy man and will become as a wife merely his domestic servant. Kill, O Yahweh, kill all those white men and women who are enjoying a spacious leisure and essentially secular culture in a mild and amoenous climate, while I have to live in bleak New England among dour Puritans and cold-hearted profiteers." That is what Mrs. Howe meant, whether or not she was fully conscious of it, when she cried out jubilantly that Yahweh was "trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored." Kill, O Yahweh, kill! Better yet, help us do it for you!

On John Brown and the conspiracy that financed him, see J. C. Furnas, *The Road to Harpers Ferry* (New York, 1959). Some of the more coherent writings of the Abolitionists were collected and edited by Louis Ruchames, *The Abolitionists* (New York, 1963). Note the constant gabble about "sinfulness," "immortal souls," and the like.

28. On the extermination of the white race in Haiti by the liberated

for the humiliation and destruction of their betters. They naturally wanted to retain on American soil hordes of emancipated slaves for the perpetual affliction of white men who had not been exterminated. American children are now taught to admire those poisonous pests in appreciation of the irreparable calamity they brought upon our nation and race. A judicious historian will wonder why Jefferson's hope that superstition could be kept within bounds proved vain.

5. Another example: Was there a continuous deterioration of character caused by an influx of undesirable immigrants and the growth of cities with their inevitable rotting of native morality?²⁹ The constant expansion of industry may have been an additional factor. William Gayley Simpson, in his admirable book, *Which Way, Western Man?*, remarks, "I remember meeting in a little fishing-village of Scotland an 80-year old shoemaker, . . . who, as a man, and even intellectually, would have put to shame most of the finished college graduates I have known. . . . I believe England and Scotland were once full of such men, and this country too a hundred years and more ago. . . . In the final testing it will be found, after all, that machines are no substitute for manhood." Americans have been taught to shy away from all unpleasant questions, but they cannot be answered by closing one's eyes and whistling a tune.

WHO'S FOR DEMOCRACY?

I have tried, not to give a synopsis of Jefferson's thought, but only to show what conditions are prerequisite for the democra-

beasts, see T. Lothrop Stoddard, *The French Revolution in San Domingo* (Boston, 1914; recently reprinted, s.l. & n.; available from Liberty Bell Publications).

29. Let me give you an example that is both concise and cogent. The death of Edgar Allen Poe in 1849 is a mystery that will never be solved, but what I call to your attention is the conjectural explanation advanced by the physician who attended him as he lay dying, which was accepted by some contemporaries without hesitation: Poe, while passing through Baltimore became intoxicated or was drugged; he was robbed and then put into one of the "tanks" maintained by one of the political parties; in such tanks a supply of men were kept, with liquor or drugs, in a state of semi-conscious abulia while remaining able to stand on their feet when supported by their keepers, who escorted them to each of the polling places in the city and voted them for honest government and righteousness. The point is that in 1849 this procedure aroused no outcry of indignation; it was evidently accepted as a part of urban life; it was just an expedient that helped the honest men of the good party to keep out or throw out the scoundrels of the bad party. Who would be so nice as to object to winning an election for righteous men?

cy he championed. If we wish to institute such a true democracy, we shall have first to create the conditions in which it is possible.

The proponents of democracy will have to begin by deporting, vaporizing, or otherwise disposing of the swarms of Jews, Congoids, Mongoloids, and mongrels that now infest our territory and are becoming ever more numerous and audacious in their unappeasable hatred of us. I cannot suggest offhand a convenient way of effecting that indispensable *épuration* of the population, but I am willing to believe that it could still be carried out.

Let us assume that you have reduced the population to Aryans, so that we once again have racial homogeneity. Forgive me, dear patriot, but I must be so tactless as to remind you that more, much more, than half of those excellent Aryans will be persons who are now writing checks whenever Falwell and his malodorous kind pitch the woo at the glassy-eyed suckers; who happily pay bureaucrats to harass and kick them or are themselves bureaucrats hired to hector the masochists; who happily send their children into the degradation and filth of "integrated" schools; who, like born slaves, cringe before the goons of Infernal Revenue and hope only to be able to chisel a few bucks here and there without incurring punishment by their owners; who are now determined never to think about the survival of their voluntarily debased and defiled race; who are so lost to manhood that they endure the most abject servitude while keeping their snouts in the swill-troughs, and so lost to common sense that they do not even perceive their servitude. These are the newly freed citizens whom you expect to govern themselves by free elections in which a majority will make an intelligent choice! Are you counting on some miracle of leadership and inspiration that will make men out of mice? Or do you intend to disenfranchise, most undemocratically, the Aryan majority in the hope that they, like men maimed by accident or war, can transmit to their offspring a genetic heritage free of their own deformity, so that a future generation of our race will recover the manhood, the self-respect, the intelligence that their sires of today have so blatantly lost?

I know that what I have just said will send many well-meaning and sentimental Americans into a tizzy or a tantrum. I am sorry, but I remind them that I did not design the universe. I did not create the realities of biology and history. And a would-be democrat, like an elfin princess who marries a mortal, must take the bitter with the sweet.

POPULISM' and 'ELITISM'

REVILO P. OLIVER

PART II

1982

LIBERTY BELL PUBLICATIONS

Copyright 1982
by Revilo Oliver

Additional copies available from:
LIBERTY BELL PUBLICATIONS
Box 21, Reedy, W.Va. 25270 USA

PART II

ÉLITISM

'Élitism' is another nonce-word, coined to avoid the ambiguity of 'aristocracy,' which properly denotes rule by the *best* citizens, a class more numerous than the few who rule in an oligarchy, and selected by some criterion other than mere wealth, which suffices in a plutocracy. An aristocracy may be an hereditarily closed caste, as were the Athenian Eupatridae and the Roman Patricii, or it may be constantly open to recruitment from the lower classes, as were the Roman Optimates and the aristocracies of the various nations of Europe. In the United States, however, propaganda has induced the grossly erroneous notion that European aristocracies were closed castes, dating from the early Middle Ages, whereas in fact the old noble families were continually augmented, and frequently jostled aside, by newcomers on whom the various monarchs bestowed titles and rank as reward for services on the battlefield, in politics and administration, or even in bed. And 'aristocracy' has been further obscured by the verbal juggling that is common in the "social sciences."¹

Although it is true that, in certain favorable circumstances, small bodies of Nordics have successfully practiced a pure democracy and decisions were made, after discussion, by a majority of the adult citizens,² the twaddle of idealists and boobherds should not blind us to the fact that no large organized society, whether of Nordics or of another race, has ever practiced "majority rule" in the sense now given to that

1. I have heard a "political scientist" describe Jefferson's democracy as "aristocratic," because under such a government no man could make money from holding political office, and there would be no loot to stimulate the formation of political parties; offices of any importance would therefore be restricted to men who could afford to hold them, i.e., landowners like Jefferson and Washington. Jeffersonian democracy is, of course, predicated on the assumption that the majority of freeholders will have the good sense to elect to high offices responsible men in whose wisdom and integrity they can reasonably trust.

2. One thinks of Iceland before the trick by which the Christians obtained control; the Vikings who assured the French king's envoy that they had no chief because they were all equal; and the town meetings of colonial New England. One of the most impressive examples of successful self-government is provided by the old assemblies and fueros of the Basques, who are not Nordic but may well be Aryan, although their unique language is not Indo-European.

term, the majority being taken as the majority of the entire population according to the new popular principle of one anthropoid, one vote.³ That, of course, is sheer moonshine, fit only to entertain children. In the great ochlocracies of the modern world, the Soviet Union and the United States, there is a great deal of gabble about rule by the "majority," i.e., the lowest stratum of the population, but it is obvious to any competent observer that in both countries the actual rule is exercised by a small and tightly-knit gang of thugs, with only the superficial difference between the two countries that in the United States it is still thought expedient to amuse the serfs by letting them choose between a Tweedledum and a Tweedledee in electoral contests that some Americans find almost as exciting as baseball games. Some *aficionados* of the electoral sport even entertain hopes that their favorite player means what he says and will, if elected, be able to effect some desired political change not sanctioned by the actual rulers; the successful candidate's fans are invariably disappointed, usually blame him for not having done the impossible, and shift their enthusiasm in the next game to another pitcher of woo. In the Soviet Union, such wasteful entertainments are unnecessary, since the proletariat is simply told what it must want.

Every attempt to institute rule by a numerical majority of a large population, even if honestly intended by its promoters, ineluctably results in rule by organized crime. Men who think seriously about the problem of governing an organized society differ in their estimate of which method of selecting a governing minority is likely to be least detrimental to the state, but agree that ochlocracy, although currently fashionable, is certain to be

3. The most famous and nearly perfect example of democracy known to history was that of ancient Athens, where the right to vote on governmental policies was extended to all male citizens over the age of eighteen; these formed about 10% of the total population, which included, of course, women, children, metics (resident aliens), and slaves. This 10% was, however, too large a number for a viable state, since a majority of the 10% was easily led into folly by unscrupulous demagogues. In the opinion of one of the most profound and judicious of all historians, Thucydides, Athens was best governed during the period in which the vote was restricted to less than 1.3% of the population; this gave a body of voters small enough to avert demagoguery and large enough to avert oligarchy and factional rule. Democracy is probably impossible without a basis in slavery or the equivalent, if the population is not very small, but, it is noteworthy that even with slavery and a franchise restricted to 10% of a population that had the highest known level of intelligence, Athenian democracy destroyed itself in less than a century. On the percentage of the population that could vote under Athenian democracy, see Professor W.R. Agard's *What Democracy Meant to the Greeks* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1942).

disastrous.

The idea of an 'intellectual aristocracy' goes back to Plato, who wished to create a caste of Phylakes ("Guardians"), persons of verified intellectual and moral superiority, to whom the government of a just and viable state should be entrusted. The Platonic proposal has exercised political philosophers ever since, and it is represented at present by the notion of an *élite*, a more or less defined group of individuals identified by their education and talents, who, it is assumed, will informally influence and direct a society without being officially identified as the actual rulers. In theory, at least, 'élitism' is compatible with almost any formal political organization, from an autocracy to a democracy. In practice, however, it seems always associated with some form of democratic theory.

When a self-constituted *élite* is not content with writing charming or eloquent essays and tries to influence political events, it almost inevitably becomes conspiratorial, and it usually becomes both hypocritical and vulnerable. Infatuated with its own sapience, a conspiratorial *élite* always risks penetration and capture by a more subtle and ruthless conspiracy, so that it becomes, in the end, a mere tool and, despite the intelligence of its members, becomes comparable to the squalid band of stupid and ignorant twerps and misfits who used to call themselves an *intelligentsia* and chatter Marxist drivel about the "workers," but were useful to their Communist trainers, who regarded them with scarcely concealed contempt.

A socially respectable and well-educated *élite* can always attract satellites who, charmed by manners and rhetoric, are content to follow the lead of the inner circle uncritically and even enthusiastically. It can thus impose, for a time at least, on men of some discernment. Thomas Jefferson, for example, seems never to have suspected the inner workings of the French Revolution, although he, who had succeeded Franklin as the American Minister in Paris, witnessed the beginnings of that catastrophe. Influenced by his French friends, including the inept Marquis de La Fayette, he did not look behind the façade that pleased them. When he reported the taking of the Bastille on 14 July 1789, he did note that "It was remarkable that not only the Invalides themselves made no opposition, but that a body of five thousand foreign troops [probably five times as numerous as the mutineers!], encamped within four hundred yards, never stirred." And he marvelled that the mob, "almost in an instant," took the Bastille, "a fortification of infinite strength," and that "How they [the mob] got in, has, as yet, been impossible of discovery." But Jefferson was content to marvel at seeming miracles, evidently unaware of the kind of thinking that brought them about. Chamfort, who was one of the

directors of the attack on the Bastille, is now chiefly remembered for his well-known aphorisms: "It is a safe bet that every opinion held by the public, every accepted norm, is sheer foolishness, inasmuch as it has suited the majority." And, "A nation is a big herd that thinks only of grazing, so that shepherds with good sheepdogs can drive it whithersoever they will." That wisdom, needless to say, was only for the inner circle of the *élite*. For the big herd, Chamfort produced ream after ream of rhetoric about *égalité* and the "sovereign people" and their inalienable "rights."

Chamfort, like his friend, the Comte de Mirabeau, whom he often served as ghost-writer and even ghost-thinker, was a member of the *élite* that was financed by the Duc d'Orléans, whose mad ambitions they probably stimulated for purposes of their own. We should, I think, give Chamfort and most of his fellow conspirators the benefit of the doubt: they probably did believe that their scintillating intellects were driving the big herd to greener pastures. By the time of his ghastly suicide, Chamfort, who was an intelligent man, had doubtless perceived that, despite their brilliance and subtlety, their plans had, in the end, proved to be little better in practice than an "opinion held by the public." It would be interesting to know, however, what explanation Chamfort gave himself as he lay dying, day after day, having escaped the guillotine by a far more agonizing death. Did he believe that he and his fellows had been like the Sorcerer's Apprentice, who rashly called up infernal powers he could not control? Or did he guess that they had schemed and labored only to clear the way for more cunning and practical conspirators, who used them and accorded them no more respect than they gave to the doltish majority?

It is extremely gratifying to have a high-voltage mind and achieve membership in an *élite* that is going to make history, especially if most of one's fellows mean well and are conspiring for High Ideals. The only drawback is that the self-appointed shepherds are likely to find eventually that they were only sheepdogs and herded the flock toward a destination of which they knew nothing.

BRITAIN'S ÉLITE

We now have before us the highly significant and extremely instructive record of an *élite* that attained a very large measure of control over the British Empire and may thus have been the decisive force in the history of the world during the half century that ended in 1945. This record is set forth in detail in the recently published work of the late Professor Carroll

Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*.⁴

Carroll Quigley, who died in 1977 at the age of sixty-seven, was a learned and highly intelligent man, the author of one of the more considerable attempts to revise Spengler's historionomy. A reader of *The Evolution of Civilizations, an Introduction to Historical Analysis* (New York, 1961, may reject many of the conclusions, but cannot doubt the quality of the author's mind. His best-known work is the long and elaborate *Tragedy and Hope, A History of the World in Our Time* (New York, 1966).⁵ I cannot here undertake to comment on the 1360 pages of that massive tome, and I shall only remark that while it does not contradict what is said in *The Anglo-American Establishment*, it mentions the subject of that book only in passing and in contexts that minimize its importance. That is significant. Quigley evidently believed in 1966 that the conclusions of his earlier work could not pass the clandestine censorship that determines what can be published commercially in the United States.⁶

4. Pp. xi + 354. New York, Books in Focus, P.O. Box 3481, Grand Central Station, \$20.00. On the dust jacket, a small American flag, inverted and reversed, appears as a patch on the Union Jack. This, joined to the title, may give at first sight the erroneous impression that Quigley's book is part of the recent flurry of silly diatribes that identify the British Secret Service as the directors of a vast conspiracy to destroy civilization and bring the United States "back under the heel (!) of the British crown."

5. Available from Liberty Bell Publications, \$25.00 + 10%. The book was first published by Macmillan in 1966. According to the *Conspiracy Digest* (a small quarterly published in Dearborn, Michigan), Summer 1976, Quigley accused his publisher of having virtually suppressed his book, which was reprinted with his permission by the Angriff Press, Hollywood, California, in 1974. Cleon Skousen, who has written a number of books that give a Jewish twist to Mormon theology and also a denunciation of Communism, published a 144-page "review" of Quigley's book under the title, *The Naked Capitalist* (Salt Lake City, 1971). According to the *Conspiracy Digest*, Fall 1976, Quigley, shortly before his death, sued Skousen, asking damages for statements made in the "review," which he considered defamatory. Quigley's death excited rumors that he "knew too much," but, so far as I know, there are no grounds for the sinister implication.

6. This obviously makes one wonder to what extent *Tragedy and Hope* was tailored to suit the market. I see nothing in it that is inconsistent with what Quigley says in the other works, allowing for his silence on matters that it would have been indiscreet to mention. I am a little puzzled, however. As I shall point out immediately below, there was an obvious reason why the book completed in 1949 could not find a publisher at that time, but I cannot see why our rulers should have wished to suppress *Tragedy and Hope*. Although the book contains a few statements of fact

Although it is now first published posthumously, *The Anglo-American Establishment* was completed in 1949 and never subsequently revised by its author, so that the reader must constantly remember when he sees references to "now" or "at present," he must understand them to mean "early in 1949" and to refer to a situation that now lies far in the past. According to a prefatory note by the present publisher, Quigley's work was not made public in 1949 because he could not find a publisher who would bring out a book that roundly and bluntly described a conspiracy, a conspiracy that was secret, powerful, and, for a time, highly successful. If we cast our minds back to 1949, we will see why it was then necessary to protect the blithe complacency of the well-trained American boobs, who had been taught that such events as the French Revolution, the Jewish capture of Russia in 1918, and the Roosevelt Revolution in the United States just happened in the course of nature, as spontaneously and as innocently as the flowers that bloom in the spring, tra-la.

The conspiracy that Quigley describes was initiated by Cecil Rhodes but soon dominated by Lord Milner, so that Quigley calls it the "Milner Group." And for the benefit of Americans who cherish their prevalent illusions about the "British Aristocracy," we must note that Milner owed nothing to his

that were sensationally exploited by Skousen, these deal chiefly with the coöperation between the Communists and the lords of international finance; most of these facts were matters of public record, and none was in the least astonishing to competent observers, while they served to commend and validate the book to readers who were astonished. The book as a whole is a learned endorsement of all the hokum that is continually administered to American serfs: wicked Senator McCarthy, who persecuted sweet innocents; wicked Hitler, who exterminated millions of God's People before they crawled into the United States; wicked "Nazis," who are psychotic destroyers of everything nice; wicked "radical Right," pathological liars who are so deficient in Christian love they don't want to kill "Fascists"; and so on *ad nauseam*. Such bunkum purveyed by so learned a man as Quigley is worth more to the rulers than all the garbage in the newspapers. *Tragedy and Hope* would never be read by the masses, but did appeal to educated men and distorted their perceptions of reality, neutralizing them politically. Far from wanting to suppress it, the Republican and Democratic gangs would have done well to sponsor it jointly.

7. Americans to whom this phrase suggests fantasies about William the Conqueror in 1066, Crusaders, and, at the latest, the Elizabethans, should take any recent issue of *Whitaker's Almanack* and consult the listing of all members of the titled aristocracy; for ranks above that of baronet, the date at which the title was first conferred is given. In 1980, for example, there were 1352 peers of the rank of baron or above (excluding children and other heirs, who derive their nobility from their father or the other

ancestry. His paternal grandfather was an obscure Englishman who sought to better himself by migrating to Germany, where he married a woman who is described as German and presumably (though not necessarily) Aryan. Their son became a physician, who practised in both England and Germany, and who elevated himself socially by marrying the daughter of a British major-general. This marriage produced one son, Alfred, who was born at Bonn and educated in Germany; he later entered Balliol College of Oxford University and distinguished himself in "Greats" (i.e., the Classics) under Jowett, and to this academic distinction he owed all his subsequent advancement. While he doubtless agreed with Jowett about the meaning of the Platonic texts, he was undoubtedly brilliant, and if you wish to think about an "intellectual aristocracy," here is a perfect specimen. At Balliol, Milner also came under the influence of Arnold Toynbee, the uncle of his namesake, the now famous propagandist and spinner of historical theories.⁸ The elder Toynbee is said to have "left behind him a beautiful memory": he excogitated his own variety of a misty Christian mysticism, which he communicated orally to his students, but of which enough is known to make it likely that he was on the best of terms with Jowett, who was not unjustly accused of having tried to "make Socrates talk like Jesus" in his translations of Platonic dialogues into English. Toynbee was also involved in muzzy schemes of social reform and in personally promoting "settlement houses" to inveigle or harass the poor into being "uplifted" by him and his coadjutors.

After Oxford, Milner became a member of the Liberal Party and soared quickly upward in the British government. He was evidently selected by Rhodes for the post of Governor of Cape Colony and Commissioner for South Africa. He did such excellent work in getting the Boer War started and in organizing the states of South Africa after the Boers had been conquered that he was created Baron in 1901, and created Viscount a year

relation whom they will eventually succeed; younger sons, daughters, and the like have courtesy ranks which do not make them members of the peerage, strictly speaking). Read through the list and count the titles that were created before 1500, before 1600, before 1700, before 1800, before 1900, and after 1900. The chronological distribution will astonish most Americans.

8. I have seen no reason to alter the judgement of the younger Toynbee's work expressed in a critique that incensed his admirers when it was published in June 1963; it is reprinted in *America's Decline*, pp. 202-211. A highly educated man and undeniably brilliant, Toynbee can serve as an example of 'intellectual aristocracy'—and a warning to political philosophers.

later. He was, behind the scenes, a power in British politics until his death in 1925.

When Milner went to South Africa in 1897, he was forty-three, but he took with him as assistants a corps of bright young men, most of them in their twenties and almost all of them with excellent scholastic records at Oxford, where some of them were still undergraduates. They came to Oxford, of course, from Eton, Winchester, and other celebrated Public Schools, noted for both scholarship and the moulding of gentlemanly character. In South Africa, this band of youngsters was called Milner's Kindergarten, but he lodged most of them in strategic administrative positions, so that it is no great exaggeration to say that he continued to govern the states of South Africa and prepare them for the eventual Union long after he returned to England and had been officially replaced by other Governors and Commissioners. The band of youths included an umbratile individual, Lionel Curtis, who never attained even a knighthood in later life although he controlled two of the conspiracy's instrumentalities, the *Round Table* and the Royal Institute of International Affairs.⁹ We need not inquire whether Curtis attained a preponderant influence over Milner's thinking or was used by Milner to initiate proposals before Milner himself endorsed them; the responsibility is, in any case, Milner's, since it is quite clear that he could have dismissed Curtis from the Group whenever he wished.

The Kindergarten, with some additions, formed what we may call the intellectual hard core of the conspiracy, which, of course, also included many men of great wealth, high social position, and political power in one or another of the British political parties and through whom the conspiracy attained influence over all three of the major parties. In an appendix Quigley lists the names of over one hundred persons whom he believes, on the basis of circumstantial evidence or inside information, to have been members of the conspiracy. These he has tentatively distributed between two secret organizations within the conspiracy: The Society of the Elect and the Association of Helpers, the latter even more tentatively divided into what Quigley considers an "inner" and "outer circle." He

9. Given the importance of Curtis in the Group, I think it worthwhile to note that, if he is correctly quoted by Quigley on pp. 27-28, he was capable of gross errors in English, at least in personal letters. Curtis was the son of an Anglican clergyman; he was educated at a minor Public School, Haileybury, and went to New College (Oxford), where he did not distinguish himself scholastically and took a degree only quite belatedly; he was nevertheless awarded a fellowship in All Souls, obviously at the behest of the Milner Group, for he had no intellectual claim to the appointment.

admits that his classification of many members is uncertain, and that there may have been others, as well as temporary associates, whom he cannot identify.

Morally, the members range from the Dutch South African, Ian Smuts, whom Quigley identifies as a self-seeking opportunist, to Milner, of whom Quigley quotes with approval Lord Tweedsmuir's characterization as "the most selfless man I have ever known. He thought of his work and his cause, much of his colleagues, never of himself." I should not think of questioning Milner's sincerity and personal integrity, and I am willing to believe that many members of his group, especially what we may call the intellectual contingent, honestly believed in the policies they were able to induce in the official governments of the British Empire during their virtual dominance over them. That, indeed, is what makes the present work so instructive a contribution to human history, transcending in its implications even the crucial period of British history that it explains.

Quigley, after saying, "In general, I agree with the goals and aims of the Milner Group," expresses horror that the Group was a conspiracy and always operated by conspiratorial tactics and methods. He even issues the warning (repeated on the jacket of this book) that "No country that values its safety should allow what the Milner Group accomplished—that is, that a small number of men would [*sic*] be able to wield such power in administration and politics . . ." Either statement taken alone is defensible in argument; taken together, they are childish and remind one of the lubberly moppets whose minds are so filled with tales about Santa Claus and Fairy Godmothers that they are constantly squealing that force and violence are wrong *per se* and that war is simply horrid and must be abolished. They also dream of abolishing gravitation, time, and death. Adults, who take account of the real world, know that conspiracies and wars are (1) morally justified when their aims are desirable and feasible, and (2) politically justified when they are successful.

The Milner Group can be judged only in terms of their purposes and their accomplishment.

THE RECORD

Although Quigley claims to have received assistance from unnamed persons who must have been members or associates of the Milner Group, he honestly admits that "it is not possible for an outsider to write about a secret group without falling into errors." He is confident, however, that his book contains "few misstatements of fact," and that the only uncertainty of any

importance lies in his list of the forty-four persons in what he terms the "outer circle" of the conspiracy. It is possible, he says, that some of these were not aware of the Group's real purposes and acted under the influence of persons who were, and it is also possible that some whom he has placed in the "outer circle" because he has no evidence that they attended the secret meetings of the conspirators really were members of the "inner circle." These are merely matters of detail, important only to a biographer of one or another of the persons concerned.

It would require a minute knowledge of all the inner history of British politics from 1875 to 1945 and months of research to verify the facts that Quigley records and his inferences and deductions from them. I can only say that on the basis of my own quite superficial knowledge, I have been able to find no misstatements of fact concerning British politics (as distinct from statements about other countries, notably France and Germany). Much more important, of course, is what Quigley does not say. A history is valid only when it is selectively comprehensive of its subject, and Quigley's conclusions must be validated, not by the facts he has accurately stated, but by the facts that he omitted because he overlooked them or thought them irrelevant or refused to consider them.

I shall call attention below to some very obvious omissions about which there can be no doubt and to others for which I have to rely on such incomplete or untested information as I have at hand. It will be seen that a complete account of unmentioned factors that may be relevant to Quigley's subject would require years of painstaking research in England and other parts of the former British Empire.

Needless to say, I cannot undertake to summarize an intricate history that Quigley has narrated as concisely as possible. His account, however, leaves us with a gigantic paradox, an unexplained mystery. My only purpose here is to suggest an explanation.

THE MECHANISM OF CONSPIRACY

The conspiracy was begun by Cecil Rhodes, the son of an English clergyman with only yeoman ancestry. When his health failed in his youth, he was sent to South Africa where, invigorated by the climate, he discovered and exploited mineral deposits containing diamonds, laying the basis of a large fortune that he increased throughout his life with a determination to devote it to the high and noble purpose of making the whole of the African continent a province of what he called the British Race, and of eventually extending the rule of that race to

dominion over the entire globe. This naturally envisaged the ultimate reunion with Britain of the part of that race that had been severed from the mother country by the deplorable schism that resulted in the independence of thirteen of the British colonies in North America—a part of the plan that always raises dangerously the blood pressure of emotional patriots in the United States, if they still cherish the delusion that they are living in an independent country of their own. Rhodes formulated plans for an organization to further his purposes when he returned to England in 1890 and made contact with an informal group of persons who had been influenced by the elder Toynbee and of whom Milner appears to have been the leading spirit. The plan first agreed upon called for a secret society modelled on the Jesuits, but having as its objective the supremacy, not of the Catholic Church, but of the British Empire. There was to be a Society of the Elect, in which Rhodes would hold a position comparable to that of the General of the Jesuits and, like that General, have closely associated Counsellors, a “junta” of three: Milner, W. T. Stead, who was then editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and R. B. Brett, who had been a member of Parliament, held a very responsible post in British government, and eventually became Viscount Esher. Beneath this supreme authority there would be a circle of Initiates, who would in turn control a much larger Association of Helpers. Membership in the organization would remain secret, and presumably all members would, like the Jesuits, be bound by oath to obey, regardless of their own opinions on any issue, the commands of the General and his Council.¹⁰

Under the influence of Milner and Brett, it is said, the plan was revised to eliminate a formal organization with its elaborate constitution, hierarchy of offices, initiations, prescribed oaths, and rites—doubtless because such things are the real weakness of a secret society, for its secrets can be, and almost invariably are, betrayed when the documents in which they are set forth are accidentally lost, purloined by disaffected members, or captured by the police. The archives of Weishaupt’s Illuminati were seized in a single raid and published by the Bavarian

10. It would be otiose to discuss here the functioning of the Jesuits in their heyday or to inquire to what extent the theoretically unlimited power of their General was in practice restricted by the three counsellors whom he could neither appoint nor dismiss. Whether Milner, Stead, and Brett were to be associated with Rhodes on the explicit understanding that he could never expel them from the conspiracy is not known.—It is unlikely that Rhodes had heard of Weishaupt’s imitation of the Jesuits, but we may assume that so well-read a man as Milner knew of it and, as we shall see, profited by the example.

government. A man who joins the Masonic religion is informed at the very first that his throat will be "cut across" if he discloses any of the secrets, and by the time he reaches the 2^o the penalty is made more dreadful: his heart will be torn from his breast, which is unpleasant enough, and furthermore it will be "given to the ravenous birds of the air or the devouring beasts of the field," which will presumably make the dead man suffer still more. But despite these and other dire penalties, all the awfully secret rituals and myths of the organization below 33^o are now fully known to everyone who takes the trouble to consult any one of the many books in which they are exposed.¹¹ And if a bunch of Jewish Elders were so indiscreet as to put in writing a systematic account of their purposes and methods, the purloinment and publication of the famous *Protocols* has been an endless source of embarrassment and expense to their ubiquitous race.¹²

For the rigmarole common to secret societies and the folly of committing secrets to paper, Milner and Brett substituted a far more practical system of organization that was made possible by the racial peculiarities of Anglo-Saxons that were educed and consolidated by the class-structure of British society before its collapse. Strict conformity to the code of gentlemen was made mandatory, not only by social penalties for known infringements of it, but, even more effectively, by a gentleman's sense of his own integrity and personal honor: a violation of the code might in some circumstances be concealed from others, but a man could not conceal from himself an humiliating awareness that he had degraded himself and was thenceforth an impostor in the caste in which he was accepted.¹³ The class-structure,

11. The most compact digest of Masonic secrets will be found in two books by the Reverend Mr. Walton Hannah, *Christian by Degrees* and *Darkness Visible* (London, Britons, 1964 and 1966 respectively). Masonry is certainly a religion, if its myths, including the allegorical exposition of some of them, are believed by the members who swear faith in them.

12. The authenticity (as distinct from the accuracy) of the *Protocols* is generally doubted or disbelieved on the basis of two considerations: (1) the estimated improbability that obviously highly intelligent and prudent men would commit to writing such dangerous secrets, and (2) the strange diversity of the stories about how the document was obtained. For one of several plausible explanations, see L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward*, edited by the Reverend Father Denis Fahey (London, Britons, 1965). I learn from *Instauration* (July 1982) that Prince Yussupov saw fit to augment the confusion by producing a new version: a parchment (!) in Hebrew (!) was discovered in the library (!) of the Countess Kleinmichel on her estate in the Crimea (!) and was sent to St. Petersburg for translation into Russian.

13. This makes pathetic and even tragic the fact that in the decadence of

furthermore, made gentlemen a small minority, personally known to each other through the system of the Public Schools, the military academies, and the two great universities as well as by long-standing family connections, and the caste was consolidated by friendships formed in early youth, when men are least capable of dissembling their characters. And the tight structure of a society of which the members were known to each other was facilitated even by the geographical size of Britain and efficiency of its railroads, all of which led to London.

This structure, peculiar to British society, which was first seriously damaged by the catastrophe called the First World War and was reduced to ruins by the Second, permitted in 1890 the organization of an effective and *really* secret conspiracy for so noble a purpose as the enhancement and extension of the British Empire and the dominion of the great race that had created it. Anyone interested in the organization of conspiracies should carefully note that the conditions requisite for a comparable conspiracy do not exist anywhere in our world today and will never reappear in the future, however distant, unless perchance the suicidal mania of Nordics today is terminated by a not too belated return to sanity or, perhaps, frustrated by some now unimaginable event.

The Milner Group, necessarily small in numbers, was recruited on the basis of almost life-long personal acquaintance and further protected by the fact that if, by some most unlikely error, an approach was made to a man who was unsympathetic or antagonistic to the scheme, gentlemen do not disclose what they are told in confidence and they do not pry into one another's personal affairs. Plans were made and policies decided orally in meetings usually held on the country estate of some member; no written rules or agreements were needed among men whose word was their bond; and if it became necessary to communicate in writing or to make a memorandum for one's own use, seemingly trivial allusions in personal letters or jottings unintelligible to others sufficed.

The Milner Group set out to control the British Empire by means that were eminently practical. They understood the importance of standing aloof from the vulgarities of party

Britain, the code served to protect traitors who were agents of the Soviet and conspired to destroy what was left of their nation; see Andrew Boyle's *The Climate of Treason* (London, 1980). On the decline of gentlemen in British society and its consequences, see General Richard Hilton's *Imperial Obituary* (Devon, Britons, 1968) and an addendum to it in my *Enemy of Our Enemies*, p. 68, n. 20. One wishes that General Hilton could have read Quigley's then unpublished book.

politics. It made little difference to them what party, Liberal, Conservative, or Labour, happened to attain a majority in a general election and temporary power. They placed their members in the high administrative posts, such as the Colonial Office, that were virtually invulnerable to the vicissitudes of party politics; those members became the experts on whose knowledge and advice the Prime Minister, whoever he happened to be, had to rely. And, more important, they set out to create in Britain a public opinion that would give to the administrative experts such support that their advice could not be ignored.

Given the structure of English society at that time, the Milner Group did not have to concern itself with the yappings of the newspapers that had large circulations and were comparable to the American press today, catering to the lowest mentality by making trivialities sensational. Their principal newspaper was the *Times*, an eminently literate daily that almost ostentatiously limited its appeal to well-educated, intelligent, and thoughtful readers who wished to understand news about domestic and foreign events. It was by far the most dignified, well-written, and influential newspaper in the world. Americans now in their forties or older will remember the prestige and power acquired by a rather feeble imitation, the *New York Times*, which exercised a great influence at one time through the manifest superiority of its journalism, although it could not have a comparable audience or observe such high standards.

England, furthermore, had a number of fortnightly, monthly, and quarterly periodicals that published, necessarily for a restricted audience of well-educated and intelligent readers, articles by highly talented authors on literary, cultural, and historical subjects, including articles that dealt with contemporary issues on a level far above party politics. The last periodical of that kind in the United States was the *American Review*, which a few of my elder readers will remember. Most of these publications took it for granted that readers would recognize not only quotations from Latin literature, but quotations from the major Greek writers, especially Homer, and students of politics should note the cohesive effect of participation in a high culture, which by itself bestows membership in a limited class that overlaps social classes. When one participant in that culture reads what is written by his intellectual fellow, he may not be convinced, if the argument is too strongly at variance with his own opinions, but he will give the argument serious consideration and credit the author with sincerity as well as scholarship, whereas he would ignore or dismiss out of hand an article leading to the same conclusions by a less polished and cultivated writer. Over the editorial policies of some of these highly influential periodicals, the

Milner Group acquired varying degrees of control, and they founded a periodical of their own, *The Round Table*, devoted entirely to contemporary affairs as they affected the Anglo-Saxon world.

The Milner Group further acquired working control of standard reference works, *The Dictionary of National Biography* and *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*,¹⁴ which they used prudently, never permitting misstatements of facts, but introducing comments which, although stated as critical opinion, took authority from the factual accuracy of the articles. They wrote or sponsored books, each seemingly its author's independent and spontaneous work, on the topics vital to their purposes, and by acquiring a large measure of control over appointments at Oxford, especially in All Souls, they were able to plant in positions of the highest intellectual prestige scholars who at least respected and favored their policies.

Here is Quigley's summary of a typical operation in the manufacture of public opinion:

The Times was influential, but . . . the greater part of its influence

14. The Twelfth Edition of the *Britannica* (1922) was the last published under the control of the Group. The Rosenwalds induced the publisher to undertake the extremely expensive production of a cheap ("Handy Volume") edition to be sold through Sears, Roebuck; this, I understand, so loaded the publisher with debt that his bankruptcy was inevitable. The assets of the bankrupted corporation were bought by the Rosenwalds, who eventually gave them to the University of Chicago. The contents of the Twelfth Edition were only gradually diluted and supplemented in the subsequent editions; the Thirteenth is not greatly inferior to the Twelfth, from which most of its articles were copied with only additions to bring them up-to-date. The Milner Group did not tamper with the really substantive articles in the *Britannica*, but inserted, even in the Eleventh Edition, discreetly eulogistic biographies of Milner, Rhodes, and other members (and oddly suppressed mention of Curtis, except for one passing reference to a book in the Twelfth), and added their interpretations of historical events in which they had a direct interest. Some student should undertake a detailed comparison of the Tenth with the Eleventh Edition in the treatment of matters of vital concern to the Milner Group, as distinct, of course, from the great increase in factual knowledge in the interval between the editions. The first twenty-five volumes of the Tenth Edition were published in 1875-1889 and are known to contain some accurate information that is omitted in the Eleventh, ostensibly because it had to be sacrificed to make room for new material. The eleven remaining volumes of the Tenth Edition were published as a supplement in 1902-1903, and it is not clear to what extent the Milner Group influenced their contents. A report on the shift in the point of view on social and political matters between 1875 and 1910 would be of very great interest and would indubitably enhance our knowledge of the conspiracy's goal in its early years.

arose from its position as one of several branches of a single group, the Milner Group. By the interaction of these various branches on one another, under the pretense that each branch was an autonomous power, the influence of each branch was increased by a process of mutual reinforcement. The unanimity among the various branches was believed by the outside world to be the result of the influence of a single Truth, while in reality it was the result of the existence of a single group. Thus, a statesman (a member of the Group) announces a policy. About the same time, the Royal Institute of International Affairs publishes a study on the subject, and an Oxford don, a Fellow of All Souls (and a member of the Group) also publishes a volume on the subject The statesman's policy is subjected to critical analysis and final approval in a "leader" in *The Times*, while the two books are reviewed (in a single review) in *The Times Literary Supplement*. Both the "leader" and the review are anonymous but are written by members of the group. [Quigley could have added that one or more reviews or corroboratory articles are planted in the periodicals such as *The Quarterly Review*.] And finally, at about the same time, an anonymous article in *The Round Table* strongly advocates the same policy. The cumulative effects of such tactics as this, even if each tactical move influences only a small number of important people, is bound to be great The strategy can be carried further by arranging for the secretary of the Rhodes Trustees to go to America for a series of "informal discussions" with former Rhodes Scholars, while a prominent retired statesman . . . is persuaded to say a few words at the unveiling of a plaque in All Souls or New College in honor of some deceased Warden. By a curious coincidence, both the "informal discussions" in America and the unveiling speech at Oxford touch on the same topical subject.

The converse of this procedure serves to stifle opposition or, at least, neutralize it. The reader will draw his own comparison with the far cruder methods used today to herd Americans who think of themselves as intellectual, although their education (except, perhaps, in some highly specialized field) was so far inferior to what was normal in England at the time that the Milner Group attained power. The brazen lying that is now so common in academic circles and even within scientific disciplines was not feasible then. Quigley exaggerates but little when, speaking of the Group's work on its highest levels, he adds:

There is no effort here to contend that the Milner Group ever falsified or even concealed evidence (although this charge could be made against *The Times*). Rather it propagated its point of view by interpretation and selection of evidence The Group as a whole was made up of intelligent men . . . who knew that their writings

were intended for a small minority as intelligent as themselves. In such conditions there could be no value in distorting or concealing evidence. To do so would discredit the instruments they controlled. By giving the facts as they stood, and as completely as could be done in consistency with the interpretation desired, a picture could be construed that would remain convincing for a long time.

And he gives a late and curious example. The official *History of The Times* (4 vols., London, 1935) may not have been the work of a member of the Group and does suppress evidence which must have been available in the files if they had not been preliminarily gutted, but the author of a vehement denial that *The Times* in 1895-1914 (when it was controlled by the Group) actively made propagandistic preparation for the war against Germany that began in 1914, nevertheless includes in his pages evidence that proves that the newspaper did in fact propagate "untrue or distorted information on 'Germany,'" which, also in fact, did much to condition the readers of *The Times* (and the far more numerous individuals whom they in turn influenced) for the declaration of war against Germany when a good opportunity presented itself (or was created).¹⁵

15. Needless to say, *The Times* did not initiate the eventually suicidal policy of hostility toward Germany, a nation which was both ethnically and militarily Britain's natural ally on the continent against both France and Russia. See the admirably comprehensive but concise work of Professor Peter H. Peel, *British Public Opinion and the Wars of German Unification, 1864-1871*, published by the International Research Institute for Political Science, College Park, Maryland; available from Liberty Bell Publications; \$20.00 plus postage. Dr. Peel thoroughly documents the achievement of the British press, both newspapers and ostensibly judicious periodicals, in whipping up animosity against the Germans, particularly on the moralistic grounds so dear to light-headed females and low-grade males. The Franco-Prussian War of 1870 provided a pretext for the first massive effort to incite the two natural allies against each other (the blatteration of the anti-German press in England naturally excited a reaction in Germany, with both equally violent recrimination and a growing fear of British intentions). The factitious hostility against Germany is usually explained in terms of resentment of Germany's ever increasing superiority in technology and her growing share of international commerce, which was partly the result of the fact that German industry started much later and so did not have the expense of retiring and replacing manufacturing plants that had become obsolete. The greater efficiency of German labor may also have been a factor. (Asquith is credited, I know not how accurately, with the statement, "If we don't defeat Germany in war, we'll have to work much harder [in industry and business].") Asquith was Prime Minister at the time the war began in 1914 and had done much to undermine the British nation before that time, but I am reluctant to believe that he could have urged war by an argument

From the standpoint of its techniques and operations, the Milner Group was a model conspiracy, perhaps the most subtle and efficient known to history, since the consistent activity of the Jews for more than twenty-five centuries far surpasses the dimensions of a conspiracy and must be regarded as simply a fact of nature, a racial peculiarity of a peculiar and unique people.

ENGLAND ÜBER ALLES

Cecil Rhodes is now best known for the munificent bequest with which he endowed the Rhodes Scholarships in the United States and Germany to further the purpose of the conspiracy he founded. He is also remembered for his noble purpose of extending civilization over the whole of the African continent. He died in 1902, and his deathbed was not made terrible by a prevision that within half a century Englishmen would become so spiritually diseased and biologically degenerate that they would not only tolerate, but actually force, the subjugation of the more virile Englishmen in Rhodesia to the savages of an irredeemably primitive race. It is reported that the great bronze statue that was erected in his honor in the land in which he planted civilization and which was named in his honor has been hacked up by the feral anthropoids,¹⁶ but it is not yet known whether his grave in the Matopo Hills has already been violated by the exulting beasts.

Rhodes, of course, was not the first to envisage British annexation of Africa. That was predicted in 1877 by Gladstone, and that "canting humbug," as a discerning Englishman calls him, was only appropriating for political advantage an idea that was already in the air and had been found acceptable.¹⁷ It is

acceptable only to morons.) While the short-sighted greed of commercial men is notorious, one can only suspect that clandestine forces were at work beneath the surface to produce the sorry record detailed in Dr. Peel's study—a record which, of course, antedates by two decades the formation of the Milner Group.

16. *The Liberty Bell*, March 1982, pp. 35 ff.

17. The idea that Britain had a manifest destiny in Africa was popularized in the 1870s by Sir Edward Arnold, who was then one of the editors of the *Daily Telegraph* and who originated in 1874 the project for a "Cape-to-Cairo railway" that Rhodes tried to carry out. Sir Edwin, who remained on the staff of the newspaper until his last illness and death in 1904, is now principally remembered for his long poem, *The Light of Asia*, which (together with his verse translation of Jayadeva's *Gītāgovindā*) is now reprinted as a paperback in India (Bombay, Jaico, 1949 and later); the poem contains some very fine lines and appeals strongly to the nebulous religiosity of so many of our contemporaries, but, despite the

true, however, that Rhodes was the first to make a real effort to realize that hope, and that he did so as a private citizen, not a politician. He was undoubtedly a great man with a vision worthy of the Arthurian knights who sought the Holy Grail—a comparison that may be more ironically true than you may at first suspect.¹⁸ That he (and, of course, the Milner Group) blundered in starting the Boer War is an undeniable historical truth; the motive, of course, was partly economic, a desire to gain the great mineral wealth of the Dutch republics for the British Empire, and partly geographic, for the Orange Free State and the Transvaal stood athwart the route of a major link in the projected Cape-to-Cairo railway and hence of communication with Rhodesia, and an alternative route through Bechuanaland, of which you may think when you glance at a map, was made impractical by the great deserts of the Kalahari and other natural obstacles. It was a costly and tragic blunder, not because it was an act of aggression, but because it was aggression in the wrong place at the wrong time, and it has left its dire legacy in a disastrous weakness of the present Republic of South Africa, the enduring antipathy of its Dutch inhabitants for the English part of its population, with, of course, the reciprocal feeling—a weakness that was effectively exploited by the aliens who, infact, now rule that unfortunate and seemingly doomed land.

Rhodes envisaged the future of the British Empire as a great federation of which the United States would eventually become

publisher's claim, must be read as a poem, not as an exposition of the doctrines of any Buddhist sect and still less as a digest of the philosophy of Gautama. Sir Edwin was employed by the Jews (Edward Lawson, né Levy, who became Baron Burnham, and his father and uncle) who owned the *Daily Telegraph*, which was the most widely read newspaper in Britain and had the then enormous circulation of 190,000, reputedly the largest in the world. At the same time, the *Morning Post*, which vied with the *Times* for influence among the upper classes, had a circulation of only 3,500. According to Dr. Peel, *op. cit.*, the *Daily Telegraph* was read chiefly by members of the lower middle class and small tradesmen, clerks, artisans, and the like, but its then prodigious circulation represented great influence over the majority of British voters, among whom imperialism must obviously have been popular.

18. Much has been written about Rhodes; a recent, well-written (and, incidentally, handsomely printed) work is John Marlowe's *Cecil Rhodes, the Anatomy of Empire* (New York, 1972). The reader must, of course, understand that any author who hopes to be published commercially today must conform to the dogma, evidently a revelation from some perverse deity, that all races are equal except our own, which was created to be a beast of burden for the others. How much of this poisonous piffle an author may believe in his own heart is, of course, quite a different matter.

a part, and in this he was, of course, followed by the Milner Group. The constituent parts of the Empire were to enjoy a large measure of local self-government, being united in their foreign policies by the Empire and rule from London. The question of taxation was one the Group could never solve, even theoretically, for they were perpetually harping on the lesson they drew from the American Revolution, and they naturally could not foresee that within half a century the people of the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, etc. would gladly subject themselves to crushing taxation for "foreign aid" to nourish and multiply their mortal enemies and hasten the date of their own extinction. The scheme of imperial federation was, as the Milner Group planned it after Rhodes' death, a figment of the imagination and foredoomed to failure for reasons they appear to have been incapable of perceiving, let alone comprehending.¹⁹ It is a great pity that Rhodes and his successors did not ponder the far more significant lesson they should have learned from the very situation they confronted when they planned the Boer War, i.e., from the grotesque blunder by which Britain had forced the establishment of the Orange Free State and the Transvaal Republic.

By every criterion, Rhodes was a great man, who dedicated himself and his fortune to a noble purpose, that of consolidating the supremacy of our race. The misconceptions in his own mind that partly accounted for the ultimate failure of his hopes are therefore of surpassing interest, an historical lesson that every White man must take to heart, if he has not resigned himself to the extinction of his posterity.

There can be no doubt that the Boer War, which Rhodes and his associates (including Milner) incited and contrived, was a great surprise to him. He started with the assumption that Dr. Jameson's raid into the Transvaal and an almost perfunctory *coup* by the British traders and adventurers in Johannesburg would suffice to bring the Dutch republics to their knees, and after he (and Milner) got the War under way, he must have been continually amazed by the valor and love of independence that made it necessary to marshal ever more of the resources of the vast British Empire to subdue the small, largely pastoral, and sparsely inhabited nations. And even after the overwhelming British forces had captured their cities and towns, the Boer commandos fought on desperately so that the war, despite the British system of concentration camps for the unfortunate

19. Quigley seems equally obtuse. He mentions just once the principal reason, but evidently without suspecting what it was: the Canadians (who in 1917 had not yet developed the suicidal mania that now afflicts them) were unwilling to accept the same status in the Empire as would be given to India, that prime example of multiracial degeneration.

women and children and of ruthless devastation of the countryside, was still raging when Rhodes died.

What makes Rhodes' miscalculation so astonishing is that he constantly and sincerely deprecated a "racial" prejudice that would separate the "English race" from the "Dutch race," noting that there was a "racial affinity" and "not much difference" between them. And he included both British and Boers in his constant advocacy of their political equality in a union of "all white men"²⁰ in South Africa. And he constantly proclaimed that the British were fighting, not the Boers, but "Krugerism," thus coining a foolish abstraction that was almost as silly as the protestations of some of our contemporaries, who claim that they want to fight "Zionism" but not the Jews. Rhodes seems never to have comprehended that what he called "Krugerism," as though it were some personal peculiarity of the President of the Transvaal, was nothing more or less than the determination of the Boers, who were chiefly of Dutch origin but included a considerable French and Scotch element, never again to submit to British rule. And of the valid reasons for that determination, he seems to have had no understanding at all.

The history of South Africa is too complex for even the most skeletal summary here, where I can do no more than mention a few crucial facts.²¹ When the Dutch first established a colony at the Cape of Good Hope in the Seventeenth Century and for long thereafter, there were no negroes in that part of Africa, which was inhabited by the even more primitive Capoids: Bushmen and Hottentots.²² By the time that Cape Colony was

20. Late in life Rhodes at least once, in an interview with journalists, substituted the phrase "all civilized men," thus evading protests from persons who liked to imagine that other races were, or could be made, capable of actual participation in European civilization.

21. For quick reference, a reasonably adequate summary of the facts may be found in the Eleventh Edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s.vv. "Cape Colony," "Natal," "Orange Free State," "Transvaal," and "South Africa." The essential facts are given without serious omission, but the reader, aware that the articles were prepared under the supervision of the Milner Group, will naturally beware of being misled by such terms as 'unenlightened,' 'reactionary,' and 'unreasonable' as applied to the Boers by men who were trying to justify the Boer War, which had created great dissatisfaction in Britain. It is noteworthy that the only member of the Milner Group who had opposed the plans for the Boer War was W. T. Stead, who, as we have noted above, was one of the triumvirate of Rhodes' first associates in the conspiracy. Stead foresaw that the war would make impossible any true reconciliation between its victors and vanquished; he was consequently expelled from the Group as a "traitor," although Rhodes and others continued to profess personal friendship for him.

22. It must always be remembered that the Capoids are a distinct race, set

formally ceded by Holland to Great Britain in 1814, however, the Blacks, chiefly Kaffirs, attracted by the loot to be obtained by raiding the colonists, had moved southward in large tribes and were, by their numbers and ferocity, an ever present menace, and, in fact, British troops had earlier been landed to protect the White settlements during the Napoleonic period. Although the Dutch naturally felt some sentimental attachment to their native land (which, however, had been much weakened by the ineptitude of the Dutch administration), British rule was welcomed as affording protection from savages that were comparable to the Indian tribes that for so long harassed and, when possible, destroyed our settlements in North America. It may be regarded as certain that had Britain shown a minimum of intelligence and prudence, the colonists would have prospered without serious dissension between the older Dutch settlers, who had largely absorbed the French, and the later English and Scotch immigrants, and the manifest superiority of the English language would have made it an additional bond of union, displacing and effacing the corrupt dialect of Dutch that is now called Afrikaans.

Prudence is seldom found in governments that have to please a large majority. As Jefferson knew, there are very sound arguments against slavery, based on realistic considerations which all require the expulsion of an inferior race from the territory that our race has taken for itself, but in Britain, as in the United States, a sentimental and irrational abhorrence of

off from all others by obvious physical and anatomical peculiarities, including the grotesque steatopygia that is so conspicuous in females and the extremely odd formation of the females' sexual organs. The complexion of the Capoids is a muddy ochre, often called "dirty yellow" without reference to whether or not the skin has been washed, and the stature of the race in its pure state is but little above that of pygmies, the males averaging four feet, six inches, in height. Most of the survivors of the Capoids have been mongrelized by miscegenation with Negroes, Whites, and Orientals. The principal difference between the Hottentots and Bushmen, aside from a diversity of dialect, was that the latter were really wild men, while the former could be domesticated and used as slaves by both Negroes and Whites, becoming low-grade servants after the abolition of slavery. At one time, Capoids occupied a very large part of Africa south of the Equator, but they were largely exterminated by Congoids that swarmed down from the north, before whom the surviving Capoids fled southward until they found uninhabited territory at the southern extremity of Africa. Before they became the prey of the Negroes, the Capoids may have led a life not unlike that of the real Pygmies, who, lurking in virtually impenetrable forests, are said by Roger Pearson (*Mankind Quarterly*, Spring 1982) to enjoy a carefree existence, untroubled by fear of anthropoid predators or thoughts of the morrow. In this, they differ little from other large mammals in favorable habitats.

slavery was incited by howling dervishes, chiefly in the more vulgar Protestant sects, who, with the effrontery common in their business, propagated the preposterous lie that Christian doctrine, as revealed by God in his holy book, forbade slavery.²³ This agitation finally induced the British government to decree the abolition of slavery in all of its territories, and in South Africa the owners of such domestic animals, which had become economically indispensable, were to be compensated by a payment of about 50% of a very low estimate of their cash value. But, with flagrant dishonesty, Britain made the sums due as compensation payable only in London. Since very few of the farmers thus despoiled could afford the enormous expense of a trip to London, they were forced to sell their claims for a small fraction of the face value to financial parasites, chiefly Jews, who bought up claims for a pittance and sent them to their tribesmen in London, who, of course, collected the full amount from the British treasury.

Quite a few Englishmen were *boers* (i.e., farmers), but they were only a minority among the English colonists; the more prosperous among them had connections that enabled them to minimize their losses, and they sometimes helped their poorer neighbors. The overwhelming majority of the Dutch colonists, however, were farmers, chiefly small farmers, comparable to the

23. As Christians who take the trouble to read their God's Word while awake must know, slavery is specifically authorized in both parts of it, e.g., in a letter written under the name of a Jew, commonly called Paul, who is said to be the first who had the idea of peddling the cult of Jesus to non-Jews, (*Coloss.* 3.22), where the English versions slightly obscure the meaning: "Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh . . . in singleness of heart." The first and key word in the original is δούλοι, which specifically means 'slave' and, strictly, a born slave as distinct from one captured in war. When holy men are reminded of such passages, they are naturally annoyed, since they have to take the trouble of resorting to their usual techniques of quibbling, double-talk, and sophistry to explain that God must have intended to agree with them, whatever he foolishly said to the contrary. The King James version, which I quoted, is not so tricky as may be thought, for when it was written, the word 'servant' retained much of its original meaning and was naturally used of slaves in territories in which slavery was economically feasible. (A hired servant was virtually a slave during the term of his employment, and it is amusing to note that Professor Willmore Kendall, in his *John Locke and the Doctrine of Majority Rule* (Urbana, Illinois, 1941), had to dismiss as "unfortunate" Locke's assumption that he was the owner of everything that his servants produced or obtained.) If you wish to test quickly the reliability of one of the recent translations of the Bible into "more modern" English, look up the passage I have cited and see whether the 'servants' of the King James version has been replaced by 'slaves.' If it has not, you will know that the new translator was either too ignorant or too dishonest to be trusted at any point.

majority of the Southern farmers in this country before the Northern conquest, and having only three or four or five slaves each. Thus the *boers* who were the principal victims of the outrageous swindle were mostly Dutch. Many of them were completely ruined, losing even their land and becoming paupers.

Even so, a crisis could have been avoided, had not the Cape Colony and adjacent settlements been overrun by a particularly mischievous kind of pest—or if the successive British governors had had the authority and courage to round up all the missionaries and load them on the first freighter out of Capetown. I must leave to competent psychiatrists the question why English Christians, particularly of the lowest classes, had the perpetual itch to meddle in other people's business and to harass both colonials and natives by despatching skulks of shamans, ostensibly for the purpose of crowding their Heaven with the ghosts of the lowest forms of human life, in which their god had shown so little interest that he had not even sent his son to be killed by the savages. The craze for afflicting the British colonial possessions with missionaries doubtless had some connection with the primitive Christians' morbid hatred of superiority, which makes the godly dote on whatever is lowly, inferior, irrational, debased, deformed, and degenerate.²⁴ The sending of missionaries was like sending "the little foxes that spoil the grapes" into a vineyard. They arrived with an animus against civilized men and a prepossession, at once malicious and maudlin, in favor of the lower races, who were, after all, the stock in trade of their business. The worst and most rabid of the lot was an especially nasty specimen, the Reverend Dr. John Philip, who was so degenerate that he married a colored woman, obviously preferring to have a servile concubine at his disposal instead of a white wife, who might have had some sense of self-respect and a mind of her own. This loud-mouthed pest was an emissary of the London Missionary Society, and he promoted his racket back home while making himself important by perpetually harassing white men for their "discrimination" against the Hottentots, who were barely human, and the Kaffirs, who were innately savage. He devised and agitated for all sorts of schemes to exploit and degrade the civilized population for the profit or exaltation of uncivilizable species that are classified as human because they have languages. And despite the protests of the more responsible governors of Cape Colony, the British government not only failed to order

24. This description, which I am glad to see taken up by other writers, comes from my review of William Gayley Simpson's *Which Way, Western Man?* in the *National Vanguard*, October 1979, which is reprinted in *America's Decline*, pp. 355 ff.

Philip hanged, but for twenty years forced the Cape government to obey the seditious agitator.²⁵

The brunt of the incessant harassment fell on the farmers, since they needed labor on their farms and, unlike dwellers in town, were exposed to constant contact with thievish Hottentots and marauding Kaffirs. Governmental harassment and oppression, ordered from London, became at length so intolerable that many farmers, most of them Dutch but including Scots and a few Englishmen, despaired of their future under British rule, foreseeing only increasing intolerance and persecution by pinchbeck saints.²⁶ They abandoned their

25. The missionaries were supported, with more or less zeal, by the clergymen of the more "evangelical" churches patronized by the English residents. The Dutch *Boers* had, of course, their own holy men in the Dutch Reformed Church, a Calvinistic outfit that knew better than to bite the hand that fed it. That church, on the whole, remained friendly to the race of its members until the assassination of Dr. Verwoerd and even so long as the balance of political power remained uncertain thereafter. But the odor of musk is not half so pervasive as that of money and even of paper substitutes for it, and recently 193 clergymen of that cult, their mouths watering for baksheesh from the Jews, signed a statement that *apartheid* is not sanctioned by the Bible or Christianity, thus denouncing their predecessors as scoundrels and liars. So far as I have heard, the congregations of the 193 shysters are so indifferent or corrupt that none of them has thus far been kicked from the steps of his church.

It is said that Philip in his last years was astonished and chagrined when he discovered that drops of magic water do not change the nature of mammals, and that the savages, though brutish, were bright enough to have exploited him as a useful idiot. Unfortunately, the Kaffirs did not have a chance to barbecue Philip: that would have been one instance of anthropophagy that would have been poetic justice.

26. As pernicious as the abolition of slavery in Cape Colony was the British mania for treating the lower races as citizens and permitting them to vote as they were told to do by missionaries and other agitators. Only the innate indolence of primitives prevented disaster. In 1887 Rhodes noted that "By the last census there are 1,250,000 natives [i.e., Capoids and Congoids] in the Colony and 250,000 Europeans. Under the present franchise, if they were to exercise it, the natives would have a majority of votes." He also noted that the idiotic idea of giving the franchise to members of what was necessarily a "subject race" was the *principal* obstacle to reconciliation between the Dutch colonists and the British government of the Cape. The crucial importance of the "native question" in determining the resistance of the two independent Republics to an extension of British rule over them is almost ignored by most historians of the Boer War. In the Union of South Africa formed after the conquest, a compromise was adopted, so that the franchise differed in the different states of the Union: in the territory of the conquered republics, only Whites could vote; in Natal, a high property qualification and other restrictions served the same purpose; in Cape Colony, there was only a low

holdings in Cape Colony and began the Great Trek northeastward into virgin and unsettled territory, where, buying land from savage tribes and defending themselves, not without considerable loss of life, against the raids by the same or other tribes, they made their settlements and brought the rudiments of civilization to regions that few white men had traversed. They hoped, of course, to make themselves forever independent of the British government and such insane or malicious enemies of their race as the Reverend Dr. John Philip. The British government did refuse to pursue the *Voortrekkers* ("Pioneers")²⁷ to continue harrying them, and Philip had to be content with abetting and encouraging the infamous trade that supplied the savages with firearms with which they could more efficiently kill white men.²⁸

As early as 1852, the British government officially recognized the independence of the Transvaal and guaranteed "in the fullest manner . . . to the emigrant farmers [i.e., *boers*] beyond the Vaal river, the right to manage their own affairs, and to govern themselves according to their own laws, without any interference on the part of the British government." Thus was founded the Transvaal Republic, and at about the same time Britain, by a royal proclamation, actually forced complete independence on the Orange Free State.

The curse of Great Britain has been the tergiversation of governments headed by politicians competing for votes. Thus the solemn pledges made in 1852 and reaffirmed in following years were broken in 1877 by the Colonial Secretary in a government of which the Prime Minister was a Jew who had

property qualification, which, however, served to exclude a large part of the inferiors, plus a saving provision that only persons of European descent could be elected to the legislature.

27. As the heroism of the pioneers was recognized in South Africa after the War, *voortrekkers* became a word of honor, and, by a neat irony, Voortrekkerpers is the name of the corporation that published in 1966 Anthony Jacob's *White Man, Think Again!* and supinely suppressed the book when the Jew-dominated government of South Africa ruled that white men should not think at all about their own future. Jacob's application of common sense to ethnological and biological facts is available in a reprint, greatly improved by enlargement of the small type used in the original printing, from Liberty Bell Publications, \$5.00 + postage.

28. This was the so-called "lower road" through Bechuanaland, a trail opened by the missionaries who were engaged in pestering the natives with an unwelcome and incomprehensible religion, but used by traders who reaped great profits from supplying the natives with firearms, which the savages really wanted. Attempts by the Transvaal Republic to cut off this trade aroused yelps from the missionaries and great indignation among the simple-minded in Great Britain.

been created the Earl of Beaconsfield in the British (!) Peerage. For this act there were several motives, but it was partly incited by the perpetual yapping about the poor "downtrodden" Blacks.²⁹ The Colonial Secretary *motu proprio* annexed the Transvaal Republic to the Empire and declared that its inhabitants had become British subjects—for their own good, of course. But after the Boers, who did not appreciate that magnanimous concern for their own good, had routed several small British detachments sent to enforce the annexation, the British in 1881 executed another pirouette and restored to the Transvaal complete self-government and an independence limited only by an agreement not to conclude treaties with foreign governments without permission from London. The British government that executed this *volte-face* did so although it had been expressly warned by General Sir Garnet Wolseley that gold had been discovered in the Transvaal and that an enormous influx of English prospectors, miners, commercial men, adventurers, and parasites would occur, soon making the Boers a numerical minority in their own country. This happened, of course, and if the citizens of the Transvaal, who had won their independence with difficulty, had accepted the principle of majority rule and granted the franchise to the horde of "outlanders" who had come to exploit the mineral wealth of their country, they would soon have found themselves again under the British government from which they had escaped through so many hardships, sacrifices, and vicissitudes of fortune.

29. There was probably some truth to the outcries that slavery was being reinstituted in the Transvaal under the legal guise of "apprenticeships." The savage tribes in the surrounding territory frequently raided each other and so always had a surplus of slaves for sale, and the *boers* recruited labor without much regard for legal niceties. All this excited busybodies in England, who knew nothing of savages but had their imaginations and "righteousness" excited by Missionary Societies. One never ceases to marvel at the bigoted ignorance or bare-faced mendacity of Christians who deny that their supposedly infallible god endorsed and authorized slavery in the "New Testament," of which the "inerrancy" is guaranteed, they say, by his direct supervision over its composition in a language which he presumably understood. To be sure, there were in the past century educated Christians whose faith was so sincere that they believed their god meant what he said; if there are any such today, I have not heard of them. For an honest discussion of slavery from a staunchly Christian point of view, see the treatise by Robert L. Dabney, Divinitatis Doctor, *A Defence of Virginia* (New York, 1867; reprinted, New York, 1969), especially pp. 146-208. Dr. Dabney correctly saw that the Abolitionists' denunciation of slavery manifested a "radical and anti-Christian tendency" that, if unchecked, would eventually destroy the religion and, perhaps, wreck the society that tolerated it. He even predicted accurately many of the antics of the hucksters who peddle the "Social Gospel" in our time.

Such is the background of the Boers' determination to resist to the utmost when Rhodes (and Milner) contrived a British declaration of war upon them.³⁰ I have sketched it to show (1) the magnitude of facts that Rhodes, in his enthusiastic scheme for an all-British Africa, could not or would not see, when he expected another annexation of the republics to proceed with little trouble, and (2) the ruthlessness with which he persued ends which, in his idealistic cogitations, justified the means he used.³¹

There can be no doubt, however, about the sincerity of Rhodes' dedication of himself to consolidating the supremacy of the Aryan race, and specifically of the Anglo-Saxon part of it, in Africa and throughout the world.

We have, furthermore, no reason to doubt the sincerity of the Englishmen who joined his conspiracy. Lord Milner, in particular, who was described as a "selfless man" in a passage I quoted above, professed—and we must believe sincerely—a most laudable purpose, which he stated explicitly in an article which he published in *The Times* in 1925 as a summary of the views he had held since his youth:

I am a British (indeed primarily an English) Nationalist. If I am also an Imperialist, it is because the destiny of the English race . . . has been to strike fresh roots in distant parts My patriotism knows no geographical, but only racial, limits. I am an Imperialist and not a

30. I have written from the Boers' point of view, and I need not add that in the Transvaal and the Orange Free State the inhabitants, largely Dutch, exhibited approximately the same characteristics as the Americans who lived on our frontier as it was moved progressively westward by expropriation of the aborigines. Much that was done in our Winning of the West was not admirable in terms of abstract morality or what was worse, even prudent provision for the future. I do not mean to gird at the British, who did have some cause for complaint and whose policies were constantly confused and muddled by their domestic politicians, especially by that "canting humbug," Gladstone, and by a partly justified fear of German expansion in Africa, which, in turn, was partly an answer to the hostility toward Germany that was being excited by the Jewish and other press in Britain; cf. note 15 *supra*.

31. One of the most unsavory of those means was the concoction of stories about atrocities committed by the Boers against English women and children in the Transvaal. The first of these was prepared long in advance of even the Jameson Raid and given to one of the few women members of the Milner conspiracy, Miss Flora Shaw, who planted it in the British press when the time came, and may have been the author of some of the "despatches from South Africa" that were used to follow up the heartbreaking appeal from fictitious women and children. The talented Miss Shaw was finally rewarded when, at the age of fifty, she became the blushing bride of Lord Lugard.

Little Englander, because I am a British Race Patriot It is not the soil of England, dear as it is to me, which is essential to arouse my patriotism, but the speech, the tradition, the spiritual heritage, the principles, the aspirations of the British race

Our first great principle [is], Follow the race. The British State must follow the race, must comprehend it wherever it settles in appreciable numbers as an independent community. If the swarms constantly being thrown off by the parent hive are lost to the State, the State is irreparably weakened. We cannot afford to part with so much of our best blood.

It would be hard to write a finer statement of a high principle or one that we may more unreservedly admire for a combination of realism and loyalty to our race. And it is noteworthy that Quigley, who is as embarrassed by mention of race as Victorian ladies were by mention of sexual intercourse, forbears to cite a statement of which he cannot have been ignorant.³² Perhaps that is a measure of the atrophy of our race's mentality since 1925.

ENGLAND UNTER ALLES

In the Milner Group we have a conspiracy by an élite—indeed, on the analogy of *la crème de la crème*, we may call it the élite of an élite. When we look at photographs of the young Englishmen who were recruited by Milner for Rhodes' great undertaking, we have to make an effort to pronounce the word 'conspiracy': they are so obviously healthy, well-balanced, well-bred. They come from the best families: the minor nobility, the gentry, the Anglican clergy. Almost all of them are products of the famous Public Schools, Eton, Winchester, Rugby, Marlborough, and of Oxford (Balliol, Magdalen, New

32. I owe the quotation to John E. Kendle, *The Round Table Movement and Imperial Union* (University of Toronto Press, 1975). This is the best companion to Quigley's book, since Kendle's "Round Table Movement" is virtually the same as Quigley's "Milner Group." Kendle has some pertinent information not in Quigley, but he thinks the Group merely a loose association of individuals, because they sometimes disagreed among themselves. He is ignorant of most of the significant indications of conspiracy assembled by Quigley, whose work was, of course, unpublished when he wrote. It is odd that Kendle apparently did not even think of consulting Quigley, who had said enough in his *Tragedy and Hope* (1966) to show that he had a special interest in the subject. Quigley must have known Milner's "credo," which I have quoted from Kendle, because the files of *The Times* were one of his principal sources. Much of Kendle's supplementary information comes from sources published after 1949, and while none of it is crucial, we must regret that Quigley never revised his manuscript, much as we sympathize with his disgust at being unable to find a publisher with a modicum of courage or interest in historical truth.

College). Almost all of them have excellent scholastic records, and many went on to hold fellowships in All Souls.

No conspiracy ever had a loftier aim or a more noble purpose. No conspiracy was better organized to escape observation and exert a hidden power over the future of a great nation and empire. And so successfully did they create 'public opinion' in the circles that counted that we could, at the cost of what we know must be an exaggeration, say that they did succeed in controlling, over several decades, the policies of the British Empire that seemed crucial to them.

For the history of their complex and devious operations, I refer you to Quigley's book, in which the essentials, at least, are set forth in detail.³³ We cannot tell from the record to what extent the conspiracy's power was supplemented and strengthened by other forces, but Quigley, writing in 1949, was able to look over the Milner Group's work during half a century and to see the results that the years since 1949 have only made the more obvious and indubitable. What is important now is what these élite conspirators accomplished.

They destroyed the British Empire.

They reduced their nation from a world-power to a small island off the western coast of Europe.

They found Englishmen the virtual masters of the world and left them a demoralized and denationalized horde, confined to an overcrowded island on which they quarrel foolishly over the ruins of their past.

They made of the Anglo-Saxons and of the whole Aryan race craven and stupefied wittings, evidently obsessed by a suicidal lust to exterminate themselves.

Had they been a nest of the most venomous enemies of their nation and their race, they could not have contrived greater disasters.

Incredible? Alas, no! The record is all there. *Every policy that the conspirators sought to impose on Great Britain was, in fact, adopted and carried out to its bitter end.* A few examples will suffice.

They helped incite the catastrophic war against Germany in

33. At certain points, particularly concerning the short reign of King Edward VIII and preparations for the catastrophic war that began in 1939, Quigley's narrative is inadequate and omits some of the activities in which the Milner Group must have been engaged. At first reading, I wondered whether the publisher had censored the manuscript by omitting sections or chapters, but on reconsideration I decided that the gaps were probably caused by Quigley's inability or unwillingness to see what was important. In 1949 and, as one may see from *Tragedy and Hope*, even as late as 1966, he still naïvely believed, or prudently feigned to believe, the Jews' intrinsically absurd propaganda about "Nazi Germany."

1914. At one point, Quigley (p. 326, n. 1) concludes, "There can be no doubt that the original inspiration for the Round Table movement was to be found in anti-German feeling.... There are some indications that this was the primary motive and that the stated purpose of working for imperial federation was, to some extent at least, a mask." They had obviously learned nothing from their first exploit, for although they exaggerated German power and preparations in alarmist statements to the public, they must have themselves underestimated the Germans as much as Rhodes underestimated the Boers, when he thought that a few hundred men in his pay could annex the two republics in short order. And they had learned nothing by 1939!³⁴

It was Milner himself who wrote the infamous "Balfour Declaration" that installed the Jews in Palestine and began the endless woes that that nest of our unappeasable enemies has brought upon the whole world.

They loudly advocated and eventually procured the independence of India, which began the total collapse of the Empire.

They argued for an imperial "federation" (although, as we have seen, that may have been a mask for their war-mongering) and they begat the grotesque abortion that is now called a "Commonwealth" and has served only to flood the British Isles with the niggers and Oriental mongrels who are obviously intended to replace the Anglo-Saxon and Celtic inhabitants by breeding themselves into a "democratic" majority. And the conspirators left the British people so impoverished in spirit and paralysed in mind that they submit to the obscene invasion with the docility of cows in a milking-shed.

Everything the Milner Group touched became disaster. And in the end their conspiracy itself perished. Even in Oxford the influence of the surviving members in 1949 had suffered a "disastrous decline," and, as Quigley continues, the survivors could scarcely believe in themselves, for it was clear that "In foreign policy their actions almost destroyed Western civilization." And thus "It would seem that the great idealistic adventure which began with Toynbee and Milner in 1875 had slowly ground its way to a finish of bitterness and ashes."

34. Some of the Group, according to Quigley, had the wicked idea that it would be best to let the nasty Germans destroy Holy Mother Russia and thus to avoid ruining Great Britain to satisfy the Jewish rancor against our race. But "public opinion in England" forced those dissidents to accept the noble purpose of attacking Germany. And who, pray tell us, Mr. Quigley, had been industriously and effectively creating that "public opinion" for decades? Cf. my preceding note.

'POPULISM' and 'ELITISM'

REVILO P. OLIVER

PART II
CONCLUSION

Copyright 1982
by Revilo Oliver

1982

LIBERTY BELL PUBLICATIONS

In every instance, the Milner Group's accomplishment was the antithesis of their intentions. One is reminded, *si licet parva componere magnis*, of the scores of myths and fables, from Ovid's story of Cephalus and Procris to the *dénouement* of *Rigoletto*, in which the man (sometimes a woman) who has devised a trap or method for the destruction of an enemy inadvertently kills the person whom he (or she) most loves. But here the victim is a nation, an empire, a civilization, a race.

Obviously, something went wrong—terribly wrong.

There is no mystery. What was wrong is obvious from the record, and I cannot believe that Professor Quigley did not have to close his eyes very tightly to avoid seeing it.

THE CANKER IN THE ROSE

Despite Quigley's bland pretense of ignorance, you will not miss a telltale odor in the very first pages. Who was Rhodes' closest confidant, the man to whom he first disclosed unreservedly the whole of his great plan? Why, as Quigley has to tell you, it was Lord Rothschild. Now so far as you could learn from Quigley, that noble Lord might have been a lineal descendant of King Canute³⁵ or of Harold the Saxon or of William the Conqueror or of Prince Rupert of the Rhine. But you know that Lord Rothschild was the first Jew to stink up the House of Lords without pretending he had had his soul laundered in holy water.

What you may miss, however, is some less glaring danger signals. Who was one of Rhodes' friends and partners in business and a member of the inmost circle of the conspiracy? As Quigley tells you, it was Alfred Beit; what he does not tell you is that Beit was a Jew who had not even taken the trouble to touch ground in England, but, from the financial citadel of Wernher, Beit & Co. in Germany, had flown directly to South Africa. He was one of the seven trustees under Rhodes' last will,

35. Since Canute's name occurs in this enumeration of the ethnic stocks that formed the English people, I remark that he is also a good example of the lies that the Christian fakirs invent to spread their gospel. Everyone has heard the silly story that Canute placed his throne on the seashore and vainly ordered the tide not to come in, thus impressing his court with the need to love Jesus, and preparing them for a sermon in which he explained his proximate trip to Rome to kiss the Pope's toe. The tale was suggested by an historical fact. Canute *did* hold back the tide by his commands. As you may learn from almost any book on the post-Roman archaeology of Britain, Canute ordered the building of a sea wall, which converted tidal marshes into dry land. There are even some indications that he sometimes watched the progress of the work from a vantage point on an adjacent hill, a temporary "throne."

and another one was Lord Rosebery, an Earl of supposedly ancient lineage, whose Scotch blood had been ennobled by a liberal infusion of the divine ichor that flows in the veins of Yahweh's Master Race through a grandmother, and whose intellect had been further sharpened by marriage to Lord Rothschild's well-endowed (and, we hope, amiable) daughter, who doubtless led him aright.

Who was another of Rhodes' early friends and loyal henchmen? Sir Abe Bailey, who later employed Winston Churchill, as the latter's schoolgirl admirers were distressed to learn when his papers were edited and published at Oxford. We know his name, but may miss the significance of the name of R. R. Brett, who was, with Milner and Stead, one of Rhodes' first "junta" of three coadjutors, and who later became Viscount Esher. Quigley mentions this man's "vital but mysterious rôle" in British government and his anticipation that the middle class would be liquidated, and even hints that Esher carried out a kind of hoax by pretending to be an emissary of King Edward VII, but he does not tell us that the noble Viscount had Jewish blood and was married to a Jewess.³⁶

A very important member of the inner circle was Robert H. Brand, son of Viscount Brand and a nephew of the seventh Duke of Devonshire. He could trace his ancestry to the first Baron Dacre in 1307, and I cannot tell you what strange birds may have nested in the family tree since then, but whatever his ancestry, he was the managing editor of the English branch of Lazard Frères, the mighty Jewish lords of finance who prey upon the world from their headquarters in Paris. I don't know what genetic factors were in Brand's blood, but we all know that in Aryans a little Jewish gold can perform a miracle greater than transubstantiation.

Other very important members of the Milner Group were Sir Alfred Zimmern, a Jew who had become Professor of International Relations (a new "science"!) in Oxford University, and Baron Maurice Hankey, whose English name had been selected as a disguise by his great-granddaddy.³⁷ Although apparently not of the inner circle, notable coadjutors in carrying out the Milner Group's policies were Rufus Isaacs, alias the Marquess of Reading, a Jules (?) Samuel,

36. According to the compilation inserted by Congressman Thorkelson of Montana in the *Congressional Record* under the date of 20 August 1940, "Viscount Esher is of Jewish blood His sister admitted it in the *Sunday Dispatch* of August 11, 1935, saying she was proud of it. He married a Jewish Hecksher."

37. According to the article in the *Congressional Digest*, the original name of this Jewish family was Alers, but that may have been just an earlier alias.

alias Baron Swythling, and Viscount Chelmsford, who may or may not have had some of the Master Race's godly ichor in his own veins, but was at least ennobled by his matrimonial alliance with God's Chosen Goldmans.

Milner's earliest official position was that of secretary to his friend and patron, Lord George Goschen, when that circumcized director of the Bank of England became Chancellor of the Exchequer under Lord Salisbury in 1887.³⁸ The banker had the power of many shekels and tribesmen behind him, and Quigley tells us that he boosted Milner into his first responsible positions in British government.

By this time, you may be ready to leap to the conclusion that the great conspiracy for Anglo-Saxon supremacy was really a synagogue that had a few *goyim* as lackeys and messenger boys, but that would be an exaggeration. As I remarked earlier, it would take years of patient research to determine just how much Jewishness there was in the Milner Group, especially if one must allow for the belief of some Jews that the genes of Jewishness are dominant over all other genetic factors wherever they occur.³⁹ If that is true, Jewish contamination of British heredity has reached such terrible proportions, especially in the upper classes, that one wonders how many Englishmen are really English.⁴⁰ But even so, a majority of the hundred

38. In the same article, Viscount Goschen is identified as a Jew on the authority of Lord Riddell. The name was Göschen when the noble lord's daddy or granddaddy flitted to England from Leipzig, but George made such financial magic in saddling England with more national debt (the new "consols" were called "Goschens"!) that he became the Lord Rector of the University of Aberdeen and also of the University of Edinburgh, and later became the First Lord of the Admiralty and was boosted into the peerage with the title of Viscount Goschen of Hawkhurst.

39. In *The Enemy of Our Enemies* (available from Liberty Bell Publications), p. 27 and note 30, cf. p. 83, n. 27, I called attention to the little-known book by Dr. Alfred Nossig (1922), who claims that "a single little drop of Jewish blood" will alter the brain cells of many subsequent generations. Evidently the drop of blood may come from either a male or female Jewish ancestor. The bearers of that hereditary taint may be unaware of it. It appears to be something like color-blindness and alters the individual's perception of reality, making him, according to Dr. Nossig, susceptible to Jewish ideas and thus innately subject to easy manipulation by God's Race.

40. How extensively the Jews had polluted the British aristocracy by the early part of this century is apparent from Hilaire Belloc's *The Jews* (London, 1922, reprinted, Hollywood, California, s.a.), p. 223: "With the opening of the twentieth century those of the great territorial English families in which there was no Jewish blood were the exception. In nearly all of them was the strain more or less marked, in some of them so strong

members of the conspiracy listed by Quigley must have been English, must they not? And if we cannot guarantee, without prolonged research, that Rhodes, the son of a British clergyman, and Milner, whose parentage we noticed above, were racially pure, we have, so far as I know, no evidence that would suggest they were not.

The foregoing paragraphs were really an excursus. We need to know no more than that Rhodes' closest friend, confidant, and financial mentor was Lord Rothschild. Of what that means Americans have just been reminded (for the thousandth time) by the publication of Bruce Allen Murphy's *The Brandeis-Frankfurter Connection: the Secret Political Activities of Two Supreme Court Justices* (Oxford University Press, 1982).⁴¹ Americans once assumed that persons appointed to the Supreme Court in Washington obeyed the rule that forbade them to implicate themselves in political activity of any kind, to say nothing of conspiracies to subvert the United States; but such rules are only for the lower races and do not apply to Yahweh's Own. They may, however, be astonished by the proof of the conspiracy between "Justice" Brandeis and Professor, later "Justice," Frankfurter, which was, of course, just part of a general Jewish conspiracy against the United States, of which one of the directors was Brandeis's close friend, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, for whom stooge Milner wrote the infamous "Balfour Declaration." Brandeis was so sure his tribe had taken over the United States by 1918 that he did not hesitate to declare that opposition to Zionism is simply disloyalty to the United States, meaning thereby the Jews' richest colonial

that though the name was still an English name... the physique and character had become wholly Jewish." By baiting matrimonial traps with their ill-gotten wealth (and, of course, by adultery, wherever possible) the Jews also infused their genes into many families of the British middle-class, but I know of no estimate of the extent of this penetration. We most urgently need, but are most unlikely to have, genetic research to test Dr. Nossig's claim, which he presents as an unquestionable certainty, and genealogical research to determine the extent of the Jews' genetic penetration of the more prosperous part of the British population.

41. My attention was first drawn to this highly significant book by a short, anonymous article in *Instauration*, July 1982, which quotes a critic as saying that Murphy (who naturally stands in awe of the Jews) "was brought kicking and screaming to the implications of his discovery [of a conspiracy]" when he edited the secret correspondence between Brandeis and Frankfurter. The article also reminds us that one of Frankfurter's prize products at Harvard was the infamous Alger Hiss, who is believed to be a White man. The Jews always train *goyim* as marionettes and put them out in front on the stage to dance for Israel. They probably chuckle as they pull the strings.

possession in North America.

As is now generally known, after the Jews had trained and curried Woodrow Wilson (who appears to have been half a blockheaded idealist and half a shyster) for the Presidency, in which they installed him by the simple device of prodding Theodore Roosevelt to organize the ephemeral Progressive Party, they forced him, by an artful combination of blackmail and bribery,⁴² to appoint to the Supreme Court an enemy alien, an enormously rich Jew named Louis Dembitz Brandeis, who was a colleague of Weizmann and naturally went to work to get the American cattle ready for the stampede into Europe in 1917 to overwhelm Germany and help the Jewish Bolsheviks destroy Russia. Subsidized through Brandeis, Frankfurter captured the Harvard Law School and later the whole University, before he took direction of the great War Criminal, Franklin Roosevelt, to complete the ruin of Europe and our civilization. The newly published correspondence between Frankfurter and Brandeis may astonish some readers, but just as William of Occam proved that whatever Yahweh wants is Good, so Americans are being taught that whatever a Jew does is Good by definition.

Like Brandeis, Baron Rothschild was a loyal member of his race and must have been amused as he did the brain-work for Rhodes and Milner, for whom it is not unlikely that he had the affection that you have for a well-trained collie or sheep dog.

Why Rhodes and Milner wagged their tails is partly explained by the amazing career of a Jew whom Quigley quite forgot to mention.⁴³ Benjamin D'Israeli, whose daddy had him sprinkled with holy water to prepare him for service under the Rothschilds, deluded the simple-minded Anglo-Saxons by an artful combination of clowning (whence the affectionate sobriquet of "Dizzy"), frankly emphatic racialism, and a strenuous promotion of British Imperialism. His racialism, vaunting the innate superiority of the "aristocrats of the world" and informing his readers of their clandestine control of all European nations, was mitigated by a flattering concession of

42. A Jewish attorney got possession of Wilson's fatuous letters to Mrs. Peck and demanded \$250,000; when Wilson admitted he could not raise the hush-money, he was told the blackmail would be paid for him if he appointed Brandeis to the Supreme Court. Note that it is to Wilson's credit that it required blackmail to force him to make an appointment so detrimental to his country, although he may not have foreseen the full consequences. When a man once yields to blackmail, he merely makes himself twice as vulnerable to further demands, since he has validated the evidence of his guilt by the first payment.

43. D'Israeli's name does not appear in the index, but a book about him is mentioned on p. 62.

racial superiority to the English, too. He was so explicit in his description of Jewish power and Jewish instigation of subversion and treason in Europe that some writers, notably Douglas Reed,⁴⁴ think that D'Israeli was actually trying to warn the British of their danger. It is to the point, however, that D'Israeli always received massive support from the Rothschilds and other fellow tribesmen, and that he, by his success in boosting himself into the British (!) Peerage as the Earl of Beaconsfield, opened the flood gates for an influx of his compatriots into English government and society. Although D'Israeli, so far as I know, never explicitly said so himself, what his racialism, taken in conjunction with his political policy of aggressive British Imperialism, suggested was that it was time for the two Superior Races to get together and dominate the world jointly. This, in turn, suggested the foolishness called "British Israel," which, in D'Israeli's time, took the form of a claim that the British were the "ten tribes" of Israelites supposedly taken captive and carried off by Sargon to some place whence they migrated to England, continuing in the British monarchy the royal line of King David, and that it was time for the "ten tribes" to be reunited with the other two and rule the world, as required by Bible Prophecy.⁴⁵ Strange as it seems to us now,

44. In his posthumous book, *The Controversy of Zion* (Durban, South Africa, 1978; available from Liberty Bell Publications).

45. So far as I know, the "British Israel" notion was first promulgated in 1822 in a book, *A Correct Account . . . Showing the English Nation to be Descendants of the Lost Ten Tribes*, by one Richard Brothers, said to have been an Anglo-Saxon. In 1793, Brothers disclosed his ancestry: he was a lineal descendant of the Biblical David and also the Nephew of God (I haven't seen Brother's genealogical chart, so I can't tell you the name of Yahweh's brother or sister, and I don't know whether the former impregnated Brothers' mama, following the precedent set by the Holy Ghost, or the latter was impregnated by Brothers' daddy, following the precedent set by Venus). Brothers was therefore the hereditary Prince of the Jews, as would be publicly confirmed by Yahweh in November 1795, whereupon the Prince would lead the Jews back into Canaan (i.e., Palestine; Brothers was the first Anglo-Saxon Zionist!). But alas! Uncle Yahweh forgot the appointment for his nephew's epiphany, and the poor fellow became dejected until Unk inspired him to tell the English who they really were in his *Correct Account*. Although Brothers attracted some True Believers, including Nathaniel Halhed, a man of considerable learning and Member of Parliament, the cult did not get under way until it stimulated the glands of less eccentric individuals, such as F. R. A. Glover, C. Piazzzi Smith (who had some standing as an astronomer and initiated more nonsense by finding marvels in the Great Pyramid), and Edward Hine, of whose major work 250,000 copies are said to have been sold, hot from the press, to eager suckers. In the Victorian Age, an epidemic of unreason oddly coincided with great achievements in the exact sciences

this nonsense excited the febrile imagination of some literate persons, who spread their gospels with spates of books filled with the usual theological sophistries, supplemented by several weekly and monthly magazines. The bizarre cult was a significant part of the atmosphere of the Victorian Age, and, with some revisions, survives even today.⁴⁶

Bizarre as "British Israel" seems, it was not much stranger than the British craze, begun by "Dizzy" D'Israeli, for clutching to their national bosom any and all members of the alien race who were (a) rich and (b) had taken the trouble to learn to speak English correctly and to behave properly in a drawing room or ball room. Our race has never been a match for the Jews in subtlety of intellect or in a chameleonic ability to simulate the manners of any nation, and the native Anglo-Saxon character has as its ideal a cultivated gentleman, perhaps somewhat bluff and hearty, who honestly says what he means. The Jewish use of language to conceal thought is so alien to our instincts as to be really unthinkable in most situations. It is easy to see how the English were taken in by D'Israeli's artful

and in philology. Douglas Reed, *op. cit.*, well describes the amazing career of a feeble-minded Canadian, Henry Wentworth Monk, who got drunk on Bible Prophecy and spent the rest of his life in a kind of *delirium garriens*, trying to help Yahweh get his poor, persecuted Chosen People back into Palestine on schedule, for otherwise Yahweh would begin to cut up rough. Such insanity is, of course, pathetically commonplace; what is significant is that the slovenly and hirsute lunatic got subventions from Ruskin and communicated his hallucinations to William Holman Hunt, a talented painter who, with Millais and Rossetti, founded the Pre-Raphaelite school of art. That will tell you something about Victorian England!

46. The more recent leaders of the cult have discovered that their Anglo-Israelite race was driven from Palestine by the Jews who, according to the common story, stayed there, and who had acted as allies of the Assyrians. They were probably also influenced by the disasters that the Jews contrived for our race in the present century, and they have become vehemently anti-Jewish (i.e., what the Jews, with their instinct for verbal deceit, call "anti-Semitic"). When I mentioned "British Israel" *obiter* in *America's Decline*, I was under the impression that "Identity" was just another name for the same group, devised, perhaps, to conciliate Anglophobes. I have been informed, however, that there are two distinct cults, which, as is normal among Christians who take their doctrines seriously, denounce each other as heretics. "British Israel" believes that we are the ten "lost tribes," who hot-footed it for the British Isles as soon as they got away from Sargon of Assyria. "Identity," I am told, believes that we are all twelve tribes of Chosen People, and that the Jews of today are impostors. The most literate and reasonable periodical devoted to this theological binge is *The Covenant Message*, published monthly at Honeydew in the Transvaal (South Africa). One must feel sympathy for cults that are trying to make Christianity an Aryan religion, and it is a great pity that their doctrines are so devoid of historical plausibility.

7
combination of flattery with seeming candor, and Christianity, of course, habituated them to the notion of miraculous mental alterations produced by a religious "conversion." Perhaps D'Israeli had been "reborn," so that his mind no longer corresponded to his body! And in the Nineteenth Century the Jews thought it expedient, with the help of the Christians, to pretend that they were a religion, not a race.

That Jewish hoax was so successful that it produced (and may still produce) a degree of fatuity that is almost unbelievable. There can be no better example than Quigley himself.

He tells us that Milner was not only the real author of the infamous "Balfour Declaration," but also the "expert" who induced the British War Cabinet to approve it.⁴⁷ He also quotes Milner's assurance to the House of Lords that it would be so nice for the good people of Palestine to have an influx of a few million Jews, bringing with them wealth, prosperity, culture, and happiness. Milner even argued, by a discreetly indirect hint, that a high-minded concern for the welfare of the dear Palestinians justified the British betrayal of the Arabs, to whom sovereignty over Palestine had been promised on the honor of His Majesty's Government to induce them to take up arms

47. We may assume that Milner was the prime mover in the preliminary intrigues that Quigley does not mention, but of which we know from Jewish sources. *News of the New World*, a minuscule but valuable periodical published at Honeydew in South Africa, quotes a book by Jacob de Haas, *Palestine, the Reality*, as containing the statement, "The Balfour Declaration of 1917 was but the public confirmation of the necessarily secret gentleman's [!] agreement of 1916." I cannot locate the book cited, but its author, in his biography, *Louis Dembitz Brandeis* (New York, 1929), p. 93, cites, on the authority of Leonard Stein, secretary of the World Zionist Organization, an even more interesting datum, a secret but official British document, dated 13 March 1916, in which it is already stated that Britain, to get the international Jews to support her against Germany, intends to let the Jews colonize Palestine and let the Jews "administer their own internal affairs." De Haas's biography is well worth reading for its unconscious assumption that whatever Jews do is right by virtue of their superiority to the lesser breeds, and for his claim that with Brandeis "the hegemony of Israel, an accepted phrase for authority in Jewry, passed from Europe to the United States." Even more interesting, however, is the statement (p. 79) that "early in the fall of 1914," either just before or just after the assassination of the Austrian Archduke to start the First World War, Brandeis got out of Woodrow Wilson and the British Ambassador in Washington a promise of British policy that "was far more concrete than was stipulated in the famous Balfour Declaration." If that is so, Britain was doubly dishonorable and made to the Arabs promises that she knew she would not keep. Query: Was Milner the contriver of that treachery or merely later made a factotum for the conspiracy behind his conspiracy?

against the Turks in the First World War. And, in conclusion, the wise Lord Milner assured his fellow Peers of England that Palestine "must never become a Jewish state." Hearing that, Lord Rothschild and Dr. Weizmann (neither of whom Quigley thought it worth while to mention) must have roared with laughter at the stupidity of the *goyim*.

Quigley wrote in 1949, long after the Jews had thanked the British for giving them a "Homeland" in their usual manner, that is, by murdering Lord Edward Moyne, the British Minister of State, in Cairo in 1944 (the dog hadn't come when his master whistled); by Begin's expertise in blowing up the King David Hotel in 1946 with such skill that more than two hundred people, most of them British men, women, and children were killed or severely injured (the bitches and their pups belonged to an intractable breed, anyway); by massacring 254 unarmed Arabs in 1948 (the Semitic swine must be taught who owns them now); and by assassinating Count Bernadotte, the stupid Swede who had the insolence to suggest mediation between God's Own and the animals God gave them. Confronted by all that evidence (which he tactfully does not mention), Quigley had to admit, sadly and reluctantly, that Milner's policy had not been entirely a success.

Quigley, being an expert in international relations, knows why the Milner Group's policy for Palestine did not turn out as well as was expected. Before I tell you the answer, however, I ask you to remember the identification of some of the coruscating lights of the Milner Group in the foregoing pages; that will prepare you for Quigley's solution: the Group made the mistake because "they did not, in their personal lives, have much real contact with Jews or any real appreciation of the finer qualities of those people."⁴⁸ I intended to write *sic* after that quotation to guarantee its accuracy, but the only appropriate words are 'sick, sicker, *very* sick.'

What makes the foregoing so astounding, so incredible that no one would believe it without indubitable documentary proof, is the fact that, as the Christians are forever assuring us with a complacent smirk, their Bible is the bestselling book to hit the stands since the invention of printing. And this extremely popular and well-known work leaves no possible doubt about the character of the Jews and their god. A good example is the tale about Joseph, the Perfect Jew, and his celestial sponsor told in *Genesis*.⁴⁹ Joseph represents the Jews' *beau idéal* of a racial patriot and has been an inspiration to countless

48. Please look on p. 170 of Quigley's book before you decide that my quotation *can't* be right.

49. There have been numerous efforts to relate the tale to some historical

68

generations of his race (or religion, if they prefer to call it that). The tale may be fairly summarized thus:

Joseph got into Egypt, supposedly sold as a slave by his Jewish brethren,⁵⁰ and, with the coöperation of Yahweh, who (like Zeus and most other gods) sends down suitable dreams at the right time, captures the confidence of an unnamed king of Egypt, who is so feeble-minded that he resigns all his royal power into the Jew's hands and is content to become a figurehead kept in luxury without responsibilities.⁵¹ Joseph proceeds to corner the entire food supply of Egypt, and then, when there is a drought (concerning which Yahweh had advance information), he puts on the screws. His tribe comes swarming into Egypt, yammering about their hardships, as usual, and they take possession of "the best of the lands," presumably kicking off the *goyim* who were living on it, and Joseph feeds them (at the expense of the Egyptian people, of course). He then sells some of his hoarded supply of food to the starving Egyptians until he has got all the money in Egypt into his eager little hands. When he has cornered the money supply of the luckless nation, the Jewish financier forces the Egyptians to give him all their herds of cattle to obtain more food,⁵² and when that is

event which could have suggested it. The most recent that has come to my attention is the work of Dr. Erich Bromme, *Untergang des Christentums* (5 vols., Berlin, 1979-80). He concludes that the Joseph story was devised as an inspirational allegory by the Jews in Babylon around 597 B.C. I cannot enter into a critique of these findings, but it is obvious, of course, that the tale was invented in some place so far from Egypt that the Jews who composed it were ignorant of the function of the Nile in Egyptian agriculture.

50. One is reminded of the clever trick by which many Jews obtained Roman citizenship in the time of the Republic and Empire. Since the Jews had planted their ghettos throughout the world and were in constant communication with each other, they naturally acquired a virtual monopoly of the slave trade. It was thus easy for a wealthy Jew to arrange with a Jewish slave-dealer to sell him as a slave to a greedy Roman, who, for a suitable fee, then emancipated him, thus giving him a Roman family name and Roman citizenship.

51. One remembers that Philo Judaeus, when he tried to give a rational explanation of the tales in the "Old Testament," implied that one proof of Yahweh's divine power is that he benumbs the minds of the *goyim* in territories that the Jews intend to infiltrate, subvert, and take over. That was why the stupefied Canaanites invited the Jews to come into their country and establish themselves as god-fearing "refugees." In the myth of the "Exodus," Yahweh befuddles the mind of the Egyptian king so that he can afflict the obviously innocent Egyptian people with all the disasters that a sadistic imagination could invent; he thus gives his pet Jews the fun of watching the Egyptians suffer before they swindle them and run off with all their valuable property.

52. This, of course, is one of the internal contradictions that Jews

gone, they have to give him all their land, and eventually they have to sell themselves and their families as slaves to the Jews to avoid starvation. Thus Joseph makes all the *goyim* his slaves, except the priests, whom he has spared, for the wily Jew understands the importance of bribing the clergy, who control a nation through its superstitions. He then moves his slaves from one end of Egypt to another, so that individuals will be separated from their former neighbors and find themselves isolated among strangers, with whom they could concert no action, were they ever to recover the spirit to do so. Having thus, in a few years, become the owner of all Egypt and its inhabitants, and having put the lower races in their proper position of servitude to God's People, Joseph naturally runs the country for the benefit of his tribesmen—all, of course, in the name of the unnamed royal nincompoop, who is presumably glad to spend all his time with his harem and be freed from the unpleasantness of having to think once in a while.

That fable, like a hundred others in the "Old Testament," should have a moral lesson, not only for Jews, but for the despised *goyim*, if they read it while not in a trance. There is no excuse for illusions about either the racial solidarity of the Jews or about what they believe themselves entitled to do to the people of the countries in which they plant their colonies. But obviously, great minds; such as those of Rhodes, Milner, and all the choice élite in their conspiracy, couldn't get the point. It is often difficult to think that the Jews' sovereign contempt for our race is not biologically justified.

But we are still left with an enigma. Granted that the gullible master minds could believe that Jews would cooperate in establishing Anglo-Saxon supremacy, how could those keen brains be persuaded to formulate and impose each and every one of the policies by which they destroyed their empire and ruined their nation? I am afraid there is only one answer, and it is painfully clear.

THE CRACK IN THE POT

One does not read very far in Quigley's book before discovering that the Milner Group was formed under the influence of the elder Toynbee, and remained enchanted by that spell to the bitter end. The conspirators were well-born, negligently leave in their fictions, of which "Anne Frank's Diary" is a good recent example. Obviously, if there was a famine so great that there was nothing for the people to eat without buying from the Jew monopolist, they would have no large herds to barter for food. It is, however, an ascertained fact that innumerable Aryans have actually believed that the tale was an historical record! Is there any hope for such mentalities?

highly intelligent, and well-educated,⁵³ and I do not know how much of the Christian mythology the several individuals imagined to be historically factual. I should suppose that most of them, like Jefferson, tried to extract from the legends an ethical system based on the acceptable parts of the teachings that are attributed to Jesus in the gospels that are commonly read.⁵⁴ However that may be, there can be no doubt but that, despite their brilliance, their heads were permanently stuffed with Toynbee's muzzy religiosity and were thereby effectively insulated from reality.

It is first of all evident that the super-brains had no understanding and even no perception of race. They retained, without ever questioning it, the Christians' bigoted and willfully blind denial of biological facts and the preposterous notion that magic rites can eliminate innate differences; the conspirators, to be sure, believed in a new kind of magic, which was to function, not by squirting holy water on Fuzzy-Wuzzies, but by "education," which could make an Englishman out of anyone. This is simply the nonsense that Macaulay uttered when he claimed that an English education could make a "brown-skinned Englishman" out of the better subjects of the Empire; and superficial minds could see justification for it in the performance of wealthy young Hindu or Moslem princes who, educated in the traditions of the British Public Schools and sent to Oxford, had learned to play cricket, ride to the

53. American readers should remember that the United States has never had counterparts or even passable imitations of the celebrated Public Schools and two great universities of England. Almost all members of the Milner Group were educated at one or another of the major Public Schools and then at Oxford, and this, especially before the aftermath of the First World War, almost automatically placed them in a social class far above the average Englishman. On the Public Schools, cf. note 68 *infra*.

54. So far as I know, no member of the Milner Group (except Sir Gilbert Murray) evinced the slightest knowledge of the history of religions or of the history of Christianity or an acquaintance with any Christian gospels except the few that were assembled in the "New Testament." Many members of the Group turned to Christian Science or to various forms of occult hocus-pocus. Note the brainstorm of Curtis that I shall mention shortly. Quigley's inclusion of Sir Gilbert in the conspiracy astonished me. I see little evidence of it in his writings. I particularly commend to thoughtful readers his essay, "The Historic Present," in *History*, XVIII (1934), pp. 289 ff., in which he draws a parallel between the First World War and the Peloponnesian War, and sees both the United States and Russia as menacing the viability of European civilization. I trust that I shall scandalize no one by suggesting that an essay by one of the most learned men of our century is in many ways comparable to Francis Parker Yockey's *The Enemy of Europe* (available from Liberty Bell Publications).

hounds, and converse with the right accent in English, displaying acquaintance with the whole of English culture, often including Latin and Greek. These young men, enjoying lavish incomes, impeccably dressed, perfectly behaved and with polished manners discreetly tinged with Oriental profuseness, were ornaments in the drawing rooms and ball rooms of the best society, becoming pet curiosities, fascinating combinations of the romantically exotic with the more steadfast conduct of Englishmen. The princelings from India were of predominantly Aryan or Semitic blood, but similar accomplishments were possible for some wealthy mulattos, especially those with a large infusion of Semitic blood, which, for some reason, often fails to lighten the dark complexion of the Black race, but sharpens the features. It is the practice of all travellers in civilized lands to do as the Romans do, when in Rome, but that, of course, is quite different from thinking in one's own mind what the Romans think. The common aphorism should have warned persons who were otherwise thoughtlessly inclined to reason from rare exceptions to the whole of foreign peoples of whom they know little or nothing (and often learned nothing, even if they visited the foreign country).

The Milner Group should have been above the level of persons who thought that a cultivated accent, well-cut evening dress, and a monocle sufficed to make an Englishman: most of them spent years in British colonies, but they learned nothing. There is an amusing anecdote about Curtis, the most feverish member of the Group. He took a whim to become a Hindu, and was astonished to discover that he couldn't do it by just reciting some rigmarole and professing to believe it. Eventually he obtained from the chief Pandits at Benares a statement of a way in which he might accomplish his purpose: he must feed a thousand Brahmins every day for a year and then promptly commit suicide by incinerating himself. He would thus win a fair chance of being reborn as a Hindu of the lowest and most menial caste.⁵⁵ Curtis, unfortunately, did not follow the

55. I take the anecdote from Kendle, *op. cit.*, p. 241, n. 50. The advice of the Pandits is perfectly logical and the reasoning is clear. As the holy men of all religions throughout the world are unanimous in declaring, the greatest spiritual merit is acquired by endowing holy men. By feeding the thousand priests for a year, Curtis would acquire a huge credit balance on the books in which the account of his *karman* is kept, and he must, of course, commit suicide at once thereafter to avoid dissipating this credit balance by committing sins that would diminish it. The only permissible mode of suicide is by burning oneself to death; that is a holy death and automatically purifies the superheated soul. With so much to his credit in the eternal and infallible computer that governs our lives, Curtis might deserve to be reborn as a low-caste Hindu and even as a male. The Pandits doubtless thought of the possibility that his account might be a little short

1

suggestion; he lived to write many formulations of policy for the conspiracy, having learned nothing from the more intelligent Pandits, who at least knew that men belong to the race in which they are born and which they cannot leave while living.

The Christian notion about the mutability of race was bad enough, but nothing in comparison with the far more poisonous idea that the English had a moral duty to serve the subject races in the Empire and make magic with "education," just as vulgar missionaries made magic with holy water and spells. Those crack-brained Imperialists even thought that the Empire was an enterprise to be conducted in the interest of the subject races, and they gabble about England's "mission" to uplift the Fuzzy-Wuzzies and all the rest. Many people (e.g., Marlowe in his biography of Rhodes) regard this as mere hypocrisy, but, sad to say, it wasn't: the madcaps must have actually believed it because they acted upon it and thereby, as even Quigley, who is sympathetic to such drivel, must admit, they destroyed the Empire and converted Great Britain to Little Britain.

It should be evident to every rational man that an Empire is to be administered for the benefit of the nation and race that created it: it is, so to speak, their investment in their own future. The British, having conquered India, had, by the immutable law of nature, the right to govern India for the benefit—the exclusive benefit—of the British. For what other reason would they have conquered it? Their one and only moral obligation was to the Englishmen who fought and died to make India a possession of their own nation and race. It was the solemn and inescapable obligation to make certain that the nation's most precious resource, the blood of its heroes, was not spent in vain—was not insanely squandered. Healthy nations know that without being told; nations that have to be told the facts of life on earth are sick—desperately sick. They are delirious.

Unless it has been smitten by some deadly disease, an Imperial power will govern its colonial possessions in its own interest and only in its own interest. To be sure, by a happy coincidence, this will generally be also in the best interests of the subject population. A wise administration will disturb native institutions and customs only so far as may be necessary to enforce its own rule or provide for the comfort of its officers. So far as is feasible, it will utilize native rulers or chiefs to execute its commands under its supervision, insisting on a strict maintenance of order and a rigorous enforcement of justice as understood by the natives in their relations with each other,

and so he might find himself a female in his next incarnation, but they evidently did not want to dismay him by mentioning that risk.

applying its own standards of equity in cases that come before its tribunals. It will take measures to preclude attempts at insurrection and ruthlessly suppress any mutiny that may occur; it will thus save many lives of its subjects. It will recognize, of course, the vast difference between a colony such as India, with an ancient culture of its own and a polyphyletic population accustomed to civilization, and Bechuanaland, inhabited by innately savage tribes.

The administration of the British colonial empire was not faultless, but it was the best known to recorded history. The British certainly gave to India the best government since the remote age in which the administration described in the *Arthasāstra* may have been a reality rather than an ideal in some of the many warring kingdoms into which India was then divided, and by our standards and probably by the Hindus' also, British rule was vastly superior to what is described in that famous manual of Indian politics. We may safely say that Great Britain gave the whole of India the best government that it ever had or is likely ever to have. Its principal shortcoming was failure to protect the Hindu and Moslem populations from mischievous meddling by missionaries and similar pests.

Such being the condition of the British Empire, how was Anglo-Saxon supremacy to be further promoted by the conspiracy that was organized for that purpose? Here is one of the Milner Group's official pronouncements, quoted by Quigley:

"The peoples of India and Egypt, no less than those of the British Isles [!] and Dominions [!], must be gradually schooled to the management of their national affairs. . . . The task of preparing for freedom the races which cannot as yet govern themselves is the supreme duty of those races who can. It is the spiritual end for which the Commonwealth [=British Empire!] exists, and material order is nothing except a means to it."

A little later in this astounding document, England is invited "to lose her life. . .to find it in a Commonwealth, wide as the world itself [!], a life greater and nobler than before." And that, mind you, is not the ranting of some Bible-toting nuisance sent into the colonies to make trouble; it is a deliberate formulation of the policy of a cleverly organized and highly sophisticated conspiracy that was founded *ad maiorem gloriam Imperii Anglorum!*

Such nauseous drivel inspired the infamous "Montagu-Chelmsford Report," which was an official publication of His Majesty's Government, and was, as Quigley makes clear, essentially the work of the Milner Group. Quigley,

however, does not even adumbrate the contents of that appalling document, which brazenly deplored the "lethargic content" of 95% of the peoples of India, who were thankful they were ruled by the British and only hoped that they would always be ruled by gentlemen whom they could respect and trust, rather than by their own people, whom they knew too well. The people of India had faith in Britain, but the report asserts that it is Britain's duty "to tear up that faith by the roots" and to incite "the most radical revolution" to encourage the 5% of malcontents (almost all of whom had been instigated by missionaries and similar pests) to terrorize and subjugate the "pathetically contented" 95% and thus prepare India for "nationhood."⁵⁶

It is not at all astonishing that the festering brains that excogitated that report could not even perceive the difference between a colony and an outpost of Great Britain. Canada, Australia, and New Zealand obviously were then what the thirteen territories in North America that became independent in 1783 had been, outposts of Great Britain, won, settled, and peopled by Englishmen and differing from Cornwall or Ulster only in being much farther from London and in still having within their boundaries aborigines who needed to be confined to reservations or otherwise made harmless. They differed totally from the colonial possessions peopled by races that had to be ruled by British governors and their British staffs. The Milner Group wanted to replace the British Empire by a "Commonwealth," as, after pertinacious agitation for years, they finally succeeded in doing, and actually proposed that "Indians must come to share in the government of the British Commonwealth as a whole."

The idea of a Commonwealth, the name now given to the debris of the British Empire, was promoted for many years 56. The essential parts of the report are quoted by General Richard Hilton in his *Imperial Obituary, the Mysterious Death of the British Empire* (Devon, Britons, 1968). General Hilton had not heard of the Milner Conspiracy when he wrote, and supposed, as I did when I commented briefly on the report and its consequences in *The Enemy of Our Enemies*, that Lord Chelmsford and Samuel "Montagu" were the authors of it. That scurvy pair must, of course, bear responsibility for what they signed, but Quigley has shown that, despite a great deal of disingenuous dissembling about the authorship, the document was practically a composition of the Milner Group, and that Curtis wrote at least a large part of the actual text. The sabotage of British rule in India was, of course, carried on by persons not believed to have been actual members of the Milner Group, notably Rufus Isaacs, alias the Marquess of Reading, when that enemy alien was made the Viceroy of India; Quigley goes no farther than to observe that some of his subversive proclamations in India "could have been written" by the Milner Group.

before the word was used outside the publications of the Milner Group, and was probably entertained secretly as early as 1909.⁵⁷ It was associated, in a way that was never precisely defined, with another project of the Group, which the periodical, *The Round Table*, was founded to promote—or so it was said. The proposal for a Federation which would ensure greater cohesion between the mother country and the several dominions might have been feasible, if Milner and his confederates had frankly based it on the racial patriotism of which Milner boasted in his “Credo,” from which we quoted above. As it was, the scheme, frequently overlaid with palaver about “educating” other races, came to naught, so that the Milner Group scored one failure, assuming that the scheme was a serious project and not, as Quigley surmised, merely a convenient guise under which to promote a war against Germany.

The conspiracy cannot be credited with full responsibility for the First World War, which, begun by the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand at Sarajevo in June 1914,⁵⁸ would have

57. Curtis claimed to have had a brain-flash (perhaps a short circuit) while on a walking tour in Canada in 1909: “It was from that moment that I first began to think of ‘the Government of each by each and of all by all’ . . . as the goal to which all human societies must tend. It was from that moment that I began to think of the British Commonwealth [of which no one had yet heard!] as the greatest instrument ever devised for enabling that principle to be realized . . . for all races and kindreds and peoples and tongues.” He modestly refrains from saying that he had just devised that “greatest instrument” in his own febrile imagination. We all know that many human beings see pixies or talk with ghosts or go for rides on “flying saucers” or get “born again,” but sane men merely smile at their hallucinations. The Milner Group, however, made Curtis their special pet and spokesman. There is no evidence that Milner or any of his confederates was addicted to opium or hashish, the hallucinatory drugs that were then most commonly used.

58. The assassination was, no doubt, arranged to provide a *casus belli* for the war that had been scheduled to begin by September 1914, as was known to Winston Churchill and doubtless others a full year in advance. The Austro-Hungarian ultimatum to Serbia was fully justified, as was Germany’s support of her ally against Russia. Both could have been, and doubtless were, predicted with absolute accuracy after the events of 1908. How flimsy a pretext for a European War was provided by the Austro-Hungarian ultimatum may be seen from an analogy drawn by Harry Elmer Barnes in one of his books. What would have been the reaction of the American people in 1914, if the Vice-President of the United States, visiting El Paso for a public ceremony, had been assassinated by a band of Mexican terrorists, secretly trained, equipped, and supported by the Mexican government or, at least, high officials in it, and if, after the assassination, most of the terrorists had escaped to Mexico, where they were protected by the Mexican government, while Mexican newspapers,

1
been over in short order, had Great Britain refrained from declaring war on Germany. The artful preparation of public opinion in England for such a war began long before Rhodes first planned his conspiracy,⁵⁹ and was doubtless carried on by the original promoters independently of the Milner Group, on whom, however, a considerable share of the responsibility must fall, for they not only labored strenuously to precipitate the war, but, given their success in other projects, might well have had the power to avert that suicidal conflict, had they so desired.

Had Britain entered the war in 1914 for a reasonable and including those maintained by that government, burst into hosannas over the glorious deed? The answer, of course, is obvious from the reaction that did follow a raid on the village of Columbus, New Mexico, by a gang of scurvy Mexican bandits who claimed to be engaged in a revolution against the Mexican government. Public opinion forced the sending into Mexico of a punitive expedition under the command of General Pershing. The analogy of the assassination in El Paso is, of course, for 1914, when (a) American Presidents and Vice-Presidents were still respected, and (b) the Americans had not yet contracted the pusillanimous death-wish that now governs their conduct. Were such an assassination by Mexican terrorists to occur in 1982, the Americans would crawl on their yellow bellies in abasement, offer to cede Texas to Mexico with an indemnity of a hundred billion dollars, and undertake to drive all Americans from Texas in an imitation of one of the fine death-marches in Europe (e.g., the expulsion of the Germans from the Sudetenland) that entertained the Jews and rejoiced the magnanimous souls of our tender-hearted "Liberals."

59. For the campaign in the press, see the work by Dr. Peter Peel cited in note 15 *supra*. Many techniques and channels were used to incite hatred and/or fear of Germany, including fiction, which, according to experts in such matters, had a great effect. A Colonel Chesney published in 1871 *The Battle of Dorking*, which purported to be the memoirs, written in 1920, of a veteran of a war in which Britain was invaded and conquered by a German army. Erskine Childers, said to have been a Jew, produced *The Riddle of the Sands* (1903; reprinted, New York, Dover, 1976), in which the hero discovers German preparations to overwhelm England by the sudden invasion of an army carried on flat-bottomed barges. (Anyone who has crossed the English Channel on a steamer (with or without a preliminary dose of dimenhydrinate) can judge the feasibility of such a plan, but English readers were presumably less critical.) Arthur Conan Doyle chimed in with a "prophetic" hair-raiser in which Britain was starved into submission by submarine warfare. Lord Tweedsmuir (John Buchan), a member of the Milner Group, turned out a whole spate of thrillers about international espionage and intrigue, and the odious villains in all of them were, of course, Germans; I no longer recall the titles. The foregoing are but the few examples that come to my mind; there were many more before the war began. After August 1914, of course, it became a patriotic duty to manufacture shocking stories and novels about the bestial Boche. E. Phillips Oppenheim's *The Great Impersonation* (reprinted, New York, Dover, s.a.) is probably the best of a bad lot.

intelligible purpose, such as the acquisition of Helgoland or the occupation of Constantinople or the annexation of Mozambique, it would have been fought sanely and, whatever the result, without serious damage to Britain. As it was, the secret purpose of Great Britain (as distinct, of course, from the purposes of the Jews) was the total destruction of Germany as an industrial and military nation, and the proclaimed purpose was a Holy War to overthrow "autocracy," by which verbal lie was meant the system of government in Germany, which meddlers supposed bad for the Germans, of whom enough had to be killed to stop them from liking it, and to scatter the blossoms of "democracy" over the whole globe. The war was thus an insane Crusade, fought for an illusory purpose in the manner of madmen, who reck not the injuries they themselves receive in their fury, and are excited by the phantoms engendered in their spastic brains. Woodrow Wilson's jabbering about "making the world safe for democracy" was nonsense imported from England and an obvious adaptation of the Milner Group's early ambition to ram "freedom" down the throat of every featherless biped in the world.

In 1914, the Milner Group finally got the war for which they longed, and we cannot forgive them on the grounds that, with the same stupidity they had shown when they started the Boer War in the belief that it would be over in a few weeks, they imagined that Germany would be brought to her knees in short order.

We all know the story that the unfortunate Sir Edward Grey,⁶⁰ at the end of the climactic day in 1914, stood by a 60. Sir Edward Grey (later Viscount of Falloden), the son of a baronet and great-grandson of the first Earl Grey, appears to have been an amiable but mediocre English gentleman, an amateur ornithologist; whose heart was in his observations of birds and notation of their songs. He entered politics as a protégé in the Liberal Party of the Lord Roseberry whom we have mentioned as a member of the Milner Group. He was evidently an irresolute man and therefore at the mercy of the advisors who told him how to show "grit and determination." It was said that he was given the Foreign Office in Asquith's Liberal Cabinet because he knew so little about foreign affairs that he would follow with assumed determination whatever policy his advisors made him adopt as his own. In an impulsive moment, probably on the advice of someone, he gave to the French in the name of His Majesty's Government assurances—and what was worse, put them in writing—which, on reconsideration, he dared not disclose to his fellow members of the Cabinet or even to the Prime Minister. A large part of his bungling and tergiversation in conducting relations with Germany sprang from fear that the French, if their demands were not satisfied, would publish his indiscretion, which he tried to cover up by inducing the Cabinet, with *suppressio veri* if not actual mendacity, to keep pledges they did not know he had made for them. It is said that his health was broken by remorse for his share in shoving Great Britain into the European War.

1

window of the Foreign Office, looking out into the fading twilight of the evening that was closing down upon London, and said, with prescience and perhaps also with a consciousness of the guilt that is said to have haunted him throughout the rest of his life, "The lamps are going out all over Europe; we shall not see them lit again in our lifetime."

The Milner Group certainly helped to extinguish the light. How great was their responsibility for precipitating the catastrophe, it is hard to say. Quigley contents himself with remarking that "the success of the Group in getting the foreign policy they wanted under a Liberal government may be explained by pressure from without through *The Times* and assistance from within through Asquith, Grey, and Haldane, and through the less obvious but no less important work of persons like Sir Eyre Crowe and *above all* Lord Esher." (My emphasis.) It is not impossible, however, that Milner and his confederates gave the decisive push to the wavering British government and thus actually caused the fatal declaration of war against Germany.⁶¹ At all events, by promoting that war they took the

61. The Prime Minister, Asquith, who came from a middle-class family that was just able to send him to Oxford, was a doctrinaire "Liberal" as well as a leader of the Liberal Party, and was deeply involved in some of its worst actions before 1914. He appears, however, to have had no real understanding of the intrigues that were forcing Britain into the war, and he may have been sincere when, a few days before the declaration, he assured the German Ambassador that "a war between our countries is wholly unthinkable." It was the next day, it seems, that he discovered the actual state of affairs when four members of his Cabinet resigned on the grounds that the government was surreptitiously moving toward war with Germany. The real decision lay with the fifth member of the Cabinet, a sleazy scoundrel named Lloyd George, who should have been in a coal mine in Wales, not in Downing Street. Had he resigned, the resignation of a majority in the Cabinet would have meant the fall of Asquith's government, but Lloyd George had his own reasons for yearning for a war. This gave Asquith pause, but at this juncture, Balfour, a member of the Milner Group, speaking in the name of the Conservative Party, assured Asquith that the Party would keep Asquith in power, if necessary, by forming a coalition government. Asquith temporized until after Grey gave a speech in Parliament, said to have been magnificent oratory, filled with high-flown morality and especially brazen lying. The war-mongering was applauded by a clique, headed by Crowe and Churchill, and Grey sent to Germany an ultimatum that made war inevitable.

Quigley stresses the Milner Group's ties to the Conservative Party through Balfour, but it must be remembered that Milner's high moral principles did not prevent him from betraying his supposed friends. He betrayed the Conservatives by having actually devised the outrageous Inheritance Tax, and betrayed the Liberals by enabling Lloyd George to take over in 1916 through unsavory intrigues that destroyed the Liberal Party as a serious contender for a majority in Parliament. It is remarkable

first irretrievable step toward the liquidation of the British Empire and the ruin of their own nation.

Although the catastrophic result of that war seems to have dampened their ardor for a time,⁶² the conspiracy, having learned nothing and the big brains of its members still buzzing with noises about a "mission" to save the world at the expense of the English people, continued its work, and, when the next crisis came, with the priggishness that made Robert Burns call morality a "deadly bane," they thought it would be "immoral" to let Germany attack the highminded Bolsheviks in the Soviet, since it would be so much more moral to make their fellow Britons suffer and die.⁶³ They must accordingly bear a large share of the responsibility for inciting what Prince Sturdza aptly called the Suicide of Europe.⁶⁴

that the high morality of idealists generally accompanies a willingness to use the most dishonorable means to attain their ends.

62. Quigley does not quote the complaint of Hichens (a member) in 1931 that the conspirators had so lost heart that they were meeting only once a month and irregular in their attendance even then. See Kendle, *op. cit.*, p. 285.

63. Quigley notices differences of opinion within the Group and even the reluctance of some members to precipitate a war with Germany just to indulge their high moral purposes some more. One member of the Group, Philip Kerr, Marquess of Lothian, even talked common sense to the British about the folly of attacking Germany for no conceivable advantage of their own. This nobleman (he was the eleventh Marquess and fifteenth Earl, holding a title that goes back to 1587) denounced the mendacious propaganda about German "war guilt" that he correctly traced back to 1870. (Cf. note 15 above.) Quigley was, or professed to be, shocked that Lord Lothian did not have an idealistic itch to bring slaughter and ruin to his own country to please Yahweh's Chosen Pets. But despite this one rational and honest man's dissent, when the hour of decision came, the rest of the Milner Group yelled in chorus for the suicidal war. Quigley does not tell us whether Lord Lothian was expelled from the Group for his rationality; one remembers that Rhodes expelled Stead when that man pointed out the folly of starting the Boer War. Lord Lothian's stand was the more honorable in that he had to recant some of his own earlier diatribes against Germany and, what is more, he had, at least in his earlier years, been infected with Milner's and Curtis's Christian hallucinations, as I shall point out a few paragraphs below.

64. A bowdlerized English translation of *The Suicide of Europe* was published by the Birch busines in 1968, which naturally suppressed all statements that might pain the delicate sensibilities of God's People. So far as I know, this dishonest falsification was first pointed out, with reference to the Romanian original, by Warren B. Heath in his introduction to the English translation of D. Băcu's *The Anti-Humans* (Englewood, Colorado, 1971; available from Liberty Bell Publications). I have been told that the tampering with Prince Sturdza's text was done without the knowledge of the wealthy American lady who subsidized the translation and publication.

That was the final achievement of Cecil Rhodes' great conspiracy to extend and expand the British Empire and assure Anglo-Saxon supremacy in the world forever. A conspiracy for the destruction of Great Britain and her race could have done no more, but we cannot justly indict the Anglo-Saxon members of the conspiracy for treason prepense. There is no evidence that they were the secret agents of the direst enemies of their nation and race. They give every evidence of having sincerely believed in what they were doing—believed that they were conspiring from patriotic motives. I am speaking now, of course, only of the Anglo-Saxons, who were always a majority and included Milner, who seems always to have been in control. The Jewish members were doubtless patriotic also, but their patriotism was for the old and subtle race that always profits from the disasters that come upon our people, whether of their devising or caused by our own folly. If they cunningly guided the Milner Group, how was it possible for them to do so?

We thus return to our original question: How did it happen that the conspiracy accomplished the very opposite of what it was organized to do? We must ask ourselves again what strange infatuation, what dark moon madness, so perverted their consciousness that they could not foresee the disasters they were inevitably creating?

Quigley has given us the answer: they had "a theory of history that saw the whole past in terms of a long struggle between the forces of evil and the forces of righteousness." In other words, their minds were infected with Zoroaster's calamitous invention, the mad notion of a cosmic war between Ahura Mazda and Ahriman, between a supreme Good God and a supreme Evil God. This, perhaps the most disastrous myth of all time, was repeated in the derivative religions, including both Christianity and Islam. This poisonous notion seems to fascinate persons who would rather feel than think, and induces not only the blackest fanaticism but also permanent hallucinations. Minds that have been sapped by it can never understand either the history of the past or the reality of the present.

The entire Milner Group, as Quigley tells us, came from a "Christian background" and had a "profound Christian outlook." As one would expect, Curtis (when not trying to become a Hindu) spouted the most nonsense, such as "Love thy neighbor as thyself" and "Die and ye shall be born again," and similar verbiage, which stimulates some glands because it would be nice if it were true. He even wrote a three-volume work to which he gave the title of Augustine's thoroughly dishonest *Civitas Dei*.⁶⁵ The borrowed title was appropriate:

65. Augustine, a typical theologian, was utterly unscrupulous. In one of his sermons, he assured his open-mouthed congregation that he had

the three volumes are fustian, woven of sophistical juggling of ideas in Curtis's mind that he evidently mistook for realities in the world outside his throbbing brain, and vapid bombast that does not even have the merit of not being insufferably dull. Curtis condensed his drivel into one volume and translated the title: *The Commonwealth of God*. Curtis was not alone in his delusions. Philip Kerr, Marquess of Lothian, a member of the conspiracy's inner circle, "held that men should strive to build the Kingdom of Heaven here upon the earth, and that the leadership in that task must fall first and foremost upon the English-speaking peoples."⁶⁶ And of the conspiracy as a whole, Quigley says that their attitude "had its ultimate roots in the Sermon on the Mount."⁶⁷ Even Quigley recognizes that such fantasies were "acutely dangerous." They were, of course, deadly.

When Milner assembled the nucleus of his conspiracy in personally brought to Jesus a wonderful tribe of niggers in Africa, who had eyes in their chests, mouths at the collar bone, but no heads, organs for which good Christians would have no use anyway. In the ranting of his *Civitas Dei*, written to prevent contemporaries from understanding what Christianity had done to the Roman Empire and what was left of civilization, particularly noteworthy is his crafty use of quotations from Varro, an author who still had high prestige but whose voluminous works were seldom read in Augustine's time. Augustine interpolated some of the quotations, but, for the most part, lifted them out of context and attributed to them spurious meanings that he invented for the occasion.

66. This information comes to us through Curtis and may be suspect. If Kerr had such hallucinations in his youth, he may have come to his senses in his more mature years, for he seems to have broken with Milner's conspiracy in later life; cf. note 63 *supra*. Building the Kingdom of God on earth, and thus taking away Jesus's job when he returns, was also the purpose professed by the shysters who peddled the "Social Gospel" from their pulpits so long as it paid good dividends. A few men really believed the social fantasies of early Christianity, notably the author of *Which Way, Western Man?* in his youth. Mr. Simpson recovered, of course, and made a thorough study of the effects of Christianity on all aspects of our civilization. I cannot too emphatically recommend his sagacious and comprehensive work (available, as I noted earlier, from Liberty Bell Publications).

67: Although this diatribe has some quality that powerfully excites the uterine sensibilities of thoughtless women, it propounds a morality fit only for vagabonds and panhandlers who are parasites on some civilized population. Perier, in the booklets cited above, p. 12, n. 13, says: "Commanded to 'take no thought for the morrow,' but to have bird-brains and be 'like the fowls of the air' that 'sow not, neither do they reap,' relying on their 'heavenly Father' to feed them, Christians who actually believed the Drivel on the Mount would, if sufficiently numerous, simply precipitate the total breakdown of any civilized or even barbarous society—and not even grow pelts for the Jews to fleece."

South Africa, his crew of young Oxonians was called his Kindergarten, presumably because they were still in their twenties, but some observers may have guessed that a part of their agile brains had not yet reached the age of puberty. They had a horror of violence, except, of course, when they were planning Holy Wars against the Devil, who had taken up his residence in the small Boer republics or in Germany. They believed that "moral force" was always superior to "brute force," and they believed that as earnestly as did the natives of Tanganyika when they boiled their babies to procure the magical grease that would render them invulnerable to bullets from the white devil's rifles. Despite the vast cultural difference, the underlying concept is about the same in both cases. Some beneficent supernatural power is there to help good boys overcome evil-doers.

Since Milner was Rhodes' first recruit after Lord Rothschild, we can understand why the Anglo-Saxon members of the conspiracy never knew what they were doing. They did not lose touch with reality at some point in their operations, as one might at first sight suppose: they never were in touch with it. Despite the cynical ruthlessness of their methods,⁶⁸ they lived in a dream world that existed only within their own skulls; they were perpetually intoxicated with their own mythology, which was as hallucinogenic as the *Amanita muscaria* or lysergic acid diethylamide.

They owed their success to a multiplicity of factors: first of all, to the intellectual prestige of Eton⁶⁹ and Oxford⁷⁰, and to

68. Even if one overlooks the morality of exciting bloody and disastrous wars to adorn the world with figments of feverish imaginations, one is appalled by the cynicism of the Milner boys when they manufactured atrocity stories to get the Boer War started, and manufactured even more outrageous lies before and during the First World War. The younger Arnold Toynbee (see note 8 above) was one of the most talented inventors in Lord Bryce's famous lie-factory, and was, of course, a member of the Milner Group. Given their control of *The Times*, the conspirators must bear part of the responsibility for a particularly effective deception of the British public on the eve of the First World War. The German government did not order mobilization of the army until after Russia had begun mobilization for the obvious purpose of attacking the Austro-Hungarian Empire, but by adroit manipulation of the news, Englishmen were made to believe that peace-loving Russians did not begin to mobilize until *after* the bellicose Germans had called up their army. By the innate morality of our race (not of others), there is a sneaking vileness about such deceptions that is far more repugnant than many crimes of open violence.

69. The name of Eton may stand for the seven or eight Public Schools that are most highly reputed and respected. To what extent the Public Schools

may be held responsible for the Milner Group is uncertain. Those schools expressly aim to form character and specifically to inculcate the standards of honor and integrity that are native to our race, but the schools generally confuse those standards with Christianity, and one remembers the pronouncements of Thomas Arnold of Rugby and other famous headmasters who claimed to have, and to communicate to their charges, a "firm conviction of the truth of Christianity." The average American knows of such schools no more than what he may have read in Thomas Hughes's *Tom Brown's School Days* (1857; often reprinted) and will remember the implicit pietism in the story. An American who seeks information from Englishmen who should know, encounters the most diverse opinions and a tendency to gyrate about the question of the supposed prevalence of homosexuality in such schools. The one thing that seems certain is that the intellectual discipline for which the great Public Schools were famous has greatly deteriorated since the First World War, as has the average character of the pupils, as was to be expected after the terrible genetic impoverishment of the race in that war. The inculcation of "Christian values" continues, and a graduate of one of the great Public Schools says that the result is a demoralizing sense of hypocrisy felt by the more alert pupils, which he would relate to the odd tropism toward Communism shown by some of them in the 1920s and 1930s. A learned Englishman tells me that he has observed that quite a few products of the great Public Schools show a satisfactory capacity for rational thought as young men, but relapse into superstition at the onset of middle age and most commonly start genuflecting to the Virgin Mary and to her terrestrial business agent, who still resides in Rome when he is not out on the road, drumming up trade. What really matters, he says, is that almost all of the graduates, even those who have permanently repudiated religion, retain in their minds and never question a mythological conception of the universe as the theatre of a "cosmic struggle between good and evil." That is almost identical with Quigley's characterization of the Group which I quote on p. 81. Waterloo, we are told, was won on the playing fields of Eton; the British Empire may have been lost in its classrooms.

70. Almost all of the Milner Group took their degrees in New College, which may therefore have been a focus of infection that I wish Quigley had investigated. Curtis, the *Fahnenträger* of the conspiracy, was actually on the books as an undergraduate in New College for fourteen years (1891-1905), the delay in taking his degree being partly explained by his holding positions of some responsibility in the governments of South Africa and in the army that invaded the Boer Republics. New is not one of the highly reputed colleges in Oxford University, but Americans should not conclude from its name that it is a pernicious recent invention; it was new in 1379. Oxonians believe that theirs is the greatest university in the world, and it is not easy to dispute their claim, but its students, though well-bred and well-educated before they come to their college, are, for the most part, adolescents, and may become tinder for inflammatory "ideals" dreamed up by eccentric dons and professors. One madcap escapade, relevant to our subject here, is well known. Ruskin, while Professor of Fine Arts, had a bee—or rather a wasp—in his bonnet about the "dignity of manual labor" and a "duty to serve the people," and enlisted a bevy of impressionable undergraduates, including the future Lord Milner and Oscar Wilde, to illustrate his opinions by paving a road for the benefit of the

the social relationships formed at those schools and through the network of family relationships of the members and their friends. They were always well financed, first by Rhodes, and then by such racial patriots as the Rothschilds, Abe Bailey, and Alfred Beit, and similar sources,⁷¹ while they were able to place many of their members in such sinecures as fellowships in All Souls, and many of their fronts, such as the Royal Institute of International Affairs, obtained lavish subventions from governmental and private sources. The near perfection of their organization enabled them to create public opinion in influential circles by the technique we have already described, and to determine governmental policy directly through members who infiltrated the government as "experts" and produced official reports that were signed by pompous figureheads or ambitious politicians glad to have their thinking done for them. But the decisive factor must have been the intellectual and moral climate of Great Britain during the crucial years from 1891 to 1939, when educated, influential, and responsible Englishmen permitted themselves to take

inhabitants of some poor village. Fortunately, Ruskin was a wealthy man, so he was able to summon from home his gardener and one or two other servants to make passable the mess that the inspired young intellectuals had made of the roadway.

In their adolescence, many highly intelligent youths are susceptible to schemes of social reform and idealistic notions that are the counterpart of the dolls with which their sisters played at an earlier age, but they can become dreadfully earnest, especially when stimulated by some older man whom they believe to be adult. They fancy themselves to be equipped with super-brains, especially when they are at Oxford, "the Kingdom of the Mind." One remembers the neat verse of Professor Dodgson ("Lewis Carroll"):

Then, then shall Oxford be herself again,
Neglect the heart and cultivate the brain—
Then this shall be the burden of our song
"All change is good—whatever is, is wrong."
Then Intellect's proud flag shall be unfurled,
And Brain, and Brain alone shall rule the world.

Like fire out of control, intellect without common sense is a terrible thing. In recent times, Oxford has fallen on evil days. How low she has fallen may be seen from the newspaper report that some crazed dons have hauled a nigger out of the cesspool in Brixton to bring social understanding to Oxford. If the archway of Tom Tower doesn't collapse when the ape is led through it, the wraiths of the great Oxonians of the past must be powerless.

⁷¹ Quigley tells us that Milner made money by serving as "confidential adviser to certain international financiers," probably on the recommendation of Lord Esher. The unnamed financiers, doubtless of Yahweh's Tribe, must have snickered behind their hands as they paid their "confidential adviser."

seriously the conspiracy's propaganda.

One can understand why Curtis's prattling about "all races and kindreds" appealed to sentimental females, especially in the lower segment of the middle class, given to Methodism or Spiritualism or Ouija boards, but how could cultivated men and women in the upper and most influential circles of British society stomach the nonsense that accompanied a professed devotion to the Empire and the race? They were by tradition Anglicans, averse from evangelical ructions, and they must have known of the major discoveries in biological (and hence truly social) science. They may not have known Mendel, whose fundamental work on genetics was almost unknown before 1900, but Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* was published in 1859, followed by his *Descent of Man* in 1871. Francis Galton's *Hereditary Genius* appeared in 1869. Educated Englishmen, readers of periodicals written for mature minds, could not have been unaware of those epochal achievements of their countrymen. In fact, no one could, for the frantic squawking of holy men, who saw the threat to their business, advertised to everyone the application of scientific knowledge to human life. Furthermore, there were many prominent Britons who knew how to govern an empire⁷² and had learned from experience the racial and social realities of the world in which we must live, as distinct from the dream world that would be ever so nice if it existed. How was it possible for visionary ideologues to drown out the voice of experience and prudence?

The only explanation, it seems to me, must be that many responsible men and women were still under the spell of a moribund religion. The Milner Group had a "profoundly Christian outlook," and so must have had many of the upperclass men and women whom the conspiracy so successfully fascinated and led to disaster. This brings us inescapably to the question I asked in my little book on Christianity.⁷³

The British who avenged in blood, as men should, the "Black Hole" of Calcutta; who, under Clive, although outnumbered more than 16 to 1, conquered Bengal at Plassey; who stormed the "impregnable" walls of Seringapatam; who later, hopelessly outnumbered, crushed the Indian Mutiny—they were Christians,

72. One such man was General Dyer, whom I mention in *The Enemy of Our Enemies*, p. 67, n. 19. His work and career were ruined by Rufus Isaacs, alias the Marquess of Reading, when that Jew was the Viceroy of India. The British deserved to lose the Empire they destroyed to please their enemies.

73. *Christianity and the Survival of the West* (2d edition, published by Howard Allen, Box 76, Cape Canaveral, Florida; \$4.00 + postage. Also available from Liberty Bell Publications.)

at least nominally, but they did not babble about thrusting "democracy" on the Hindus and Moslems. Some of them were heavy drinkers, but not even when drunk did they have a sick hallucination that they had a duty to do good to everyone but themselves.

The Englishmen who, like Athenians of the great age, forced every sea and land to lie open to their valor, and who everywhere left behind them, whether of weal or of woe, imperishable memorials of their greatness, were Christians, but they were also men, Nordic men, who knew that they who will not live by the sword must die by it.

It is hard to believe that the Englishmen who won their Empire for themselves and their posterity sired sanctimonious twerps who jabber about "world peace" and "social justice" and who want "to serve all mankind." How did Christianity become a degenerative disease of our race?

THE RESIDUE

Six possible explanations may be drawn from as many conceptions of the essential substance of the religion. A few Christian groups today contend that Western Christianity has been perverted and poisoned, partly or largely through the covert influence of the Jews in their attack on our race. Lawrence Brown discreetly intimated and Ralph Perier said bluntly that Christianity, a Semitic cult, is an alien superstition, incompatible with the mentality and morality of our race, and the learned Savitri Devi concluded, concisely and forthrightly, that Christianity "is the oldest and most successful invention of the Jews to emasculate the Aryan race." Between these categorical determinations lie four other explanations of our decadence which place less responsibility on the Jews or dismiss their activities as largely adventitious and opportunistic.

A critique of Christianity would take us far beyond the limits of this article. It would require us to sift an enormous mass of data to determine, so far as possible, the function of religion in the history of our race and the place of Christianity in the history of religions. To so audacious a task I hope soon to address myself. In the meantime, I can only consider a problem that will already have occurred to the reader.

Between the men who won the British Empire and their pusillanimous heirs today lies an historical period marked by a steady decline of belief in the veracity of the Christian Scriptures. And that belief constantly diminished during the decades in which the crackpots of Milner's conspiracy were most influential. It would not be easy to calculate a percentage of belief in the prevalent religion during late Victorian times,

when the British Empire reached its apogee, but the lowest possible figure would be many times greater than a corresponding estimate today. In 1942, a judicious observer, Professor A. N. Whitehead, after a diligent investigation, concluded that in Britain "far less than one-fifth of the population are *in any sense* Christians today." And according to the most competent observers in Britain today, there has been a gradual but constant decline during the past forty years. In other words, the collapse of the Empire paralleled a collapse of Christian faith, and it would seem at first sight that if there is a causal relationship, the disintegration of the Empire (and with it, of course, viability of our race) should be attributed, not to the religion, but rather to the decay of faith in it. That is to ignore the operation of what we may call the law of cultural residues:

In all civilized societies, when a long-established and generally accepted belief is found to be incredible, good minds abandon it, but they commonly retain derivative beliefs that were originally deduced from the creed they have rejected and logically must depend on it. When we speak of a once dominant religion, we must distinguish carefully between belief in its dogma and acceptance of the elements it has contributed to the prevailing *Weltanschauung*—elements that have been taken for granted by so many generations that their religious origin has been virtually forgotten. Of dogmas, as of men, it can be said that the evil they do lives after them.

Religions that have firmly rooted themselves in a culture have, like crab grass, a vitality that enables them to survive the uprooting of any part of their dogma. That is evident from even the most hurried glance at our history since the Renaissance.

Western Christianity, the religion that had been made tolerable to our race by various compromises and doctrinal modifications, remained a unity until the great schism, begun by Martin Luther, brought with it a great emphasis on the "inerrancy" of the Holy Book, which was the basis of Protestant doctrines and communicated by induction to the Catholics, as all sects divulged the Scriptures in vernacular translations. Almost simultaneously, however, the Copernican revival of astronomy based on the heliocentric structure of the solar system, confirmed by Kepler and other observers, became an irrefutable proof that the author of God's Word had been abysmally ignorant of the most basic form of the world he supposedly created. And after the fakirs learned by experience that no ingenuity in torturing or murdering intelligent and honest men could stop the earth from revolving about the sun, the theologians of the various sects turned their craft to devising verbal juggling that would explain why their god had not told the truth. The masses, as always, had no difficulty in

believing whatever suited their fancy, but among men and women of some cultivation the result was that a small minority turned to outright atheism, but most of the persons who could no longer believe the Biblical myths adopted the deism that we have seen in Jefferson, which was the belief of most of our Founding Fathers, although they may have been more circumspect in stating it only to intimate friends.

The deists' monotheism was more than a simple revival of Graeco-Roman Stoicism. In leaving Christianity, they took with them as much of the religion as they could, especially the parts that directly affected social morality and accepted conventions, including some that had been extolled by holy men but tacitly ignored in practice. Their deity was a creator who had known what he was doing, and of whose existence a proof could be sought in the mathematical neatness of Kepler's Laws, but the Jesus of the "New Testament," shorn of his divinity, was respected as a moralist, and Jefferson, as we have seen, even salvaged the fantastic Sermon on the Mount, regarding it as edifying reading, even though it was so charged with Oriental "hyperbolism" that it was scarcely relevant to quotidian life.

So much is obvious, but let us dare to ask a question that will curl the pages of your favorite textbook of Modern History. Everyone knows that the French Revolution was violently anti-Christian, and that although its leaders included some atheists, such as Hébert, its dominant faith was deism, which became the established cult after that bloody beast, Robespierre, legislated into existence his pet Être Suprême. A long line of able and conscientious writers, including the learned Abbé Augustine Barruel,⁷⁴ Professor John Robison,⁷⁵ Nesta Webster,⁷⁶ and the eminent ecclesiastic who wrote under the name of Maurice Pinay,⁷⁷ have plausibly described the French

74. See his *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du Jacobinisme*, revus et corrigés par l'auteur, Lyons, 1818, which was handsomely reprinted from new type at Vouillé, Chiré-en-Montreuil, by a small group of admirably courageous and dedicated Catholics, "Diffusion de la Pensée Française," in 1973. (Strikes in France prevented actual publication until 1975). No one should attempt to use or criticize Barruel as an historical source except on the basis of this edition, which differs greatly from his first edition, London, 1797-98, which was written and published when he was in exile, did not have access to many important documents, and was unable to verify his recollection of various events. The English translation, based on the first edition, is therefore untrustworthy and will betray its readers into more or less serious errors on many points. Barruel's conception of history is, of course, colored by his apparently sincere conviction of the truth of Christianity, but he was honest. For example, he resisted the pious temptation to repeat the lie propagated by holy men who had tried to neutralize the celebrated work of Father Meslier by alleging that it had been forged by Voltaire. (Voltaire did produce a short summary of the

Revolution as the work of a conspiracy against Christianity. But if we ignore the diverse and often conflicting ambitions and secret motives of its promoters and consider only their professed purposes, was not the Revolution really an attempt to establish at once the Heaven on Earth that, according to the Christians' favorite horror story, would be established by Jesus after he smashed up the universe or, at least, some little part of it around the earth, say within a radius of a thousand light years? ⁷ ⁸ Did not the homicidal maniacs

work and interpolated it to make Meslier endorse deism, which Voltaire thought socially necessary to avert anarchy. Barruel is a prime source for all later writers on the subject, and when you read them, be sure to ascertain which edition of his *Mémoires* they used.

75. The third edition of *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against all the Religions and Governments of Europe*, containing an added postscript, was published at London and Edinburgh in 1798. It was copied and called "fourth edition" by the American publisher, New York, 1798. One or the other of these printings was reproduced anastatically around 1960, as I remember, but I cannot give an exact reference. An edition from reset type was published as an "Americanist Classic" by the Birch business in 1967. It is the work of an anonymous editor, so ignorant or negligent that in his own pages he sometimes seems unaware of the correct form of the possessive case in English and the function of capital letters. In his transcription of Robison's text, he was so ignorant of French and Latin that he often confused the long form of the letter *s* with the letter *f*. These blunders may have been corrected in later printings.

76. Her three most important works on this subject, *The French Revolution* (1919), *World Revolution: the Plot Against Civilisation* (1921), and *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements* (1924), have all been reprinted and are available from Liberty Bell Publications. An edition of *World Revolution*, revised and augmented by Anthony Gittens, Devon, Britons, 1971, went out-of-print with the liquidation of the publisher and is said to have become rare. Mrs. Webster's two volumes on *Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette* (London, 1936-38) add a few details to her earlier work.

77. The most satisfactory edition which I have seen is the Spanish translation, *Complot contra la Iglesia* (Caracas, Venezuela, 1964). There is a barely passable English translation of the German translation, supplemented from the Spanish, *The Plot Against the Church* (Los Angeles, St. Anthony Press, and Hawthorne, California, Omni, 1967). I have not seen the Italian original (Rome, 1962). The German translation (1963) is truncated.

78. This apocalyptic fantasy strongly contrasts with the characteristic view of Aryan religions, which assume a happier (but not Paradisical) state in the past, lost by the slow declension of the human race. *Nam genus hoc vivo iam decrescebat Homero . . . Aetas parentum, peior avis, tulit nos nequiores . . .* For this pessimism there was a real basis in the dysgenic effects of civilization, even in cultures free of Christianity. The biological process is concisely described by the late Professor Elmer Pendell in *Why Civilizations Self-Destruct* (Cape Canaveral, Florida, 1977).

think of themselves as Saviours, come to extirpate the evil incarnate in the "aristocrats," that is to say the educated and refined French men and women who were largely Nordic and included much of the best blood in France? When they gabbled about *liberté, égalité, fraternité*, were they not simply reproducing, with only superficial changes, the revolutionary and proletarian ardors of Christianity, which inspired many parts of the "New Testament," but had been tacitly suppressed, so far as possible, by the Roman Church and most of the Protestant sects? ⁷⁹ Did they not believe that "the truth [of Rousseau's gospel] shall make you free"? Whence did they derive the mad notion that "all men are created equal," if not from the foolish denial of the obvious by the Christians? ⁸⁰ From what other source well-known to them could they have taken the notion of a 'brotherhood' that was not genealogical, national, or racial, but embraced all True Believers, with a spiteful disregard of heredity and human nature? And was not their blood-lust inspired by the primitive Christian hatred of all superiority, physical, mental, or moral? A very good case can be made for the proposition that the *Leitmotif* of the French Revolution was an anti-clerical Christianity, an insane attempt to realize Christian "ideals" after jettisoning the Scriptures from

79. There were, of course, exceptions, and various small Protestant sects, such as the Anabaptists, tried to revive Biblical doctrines that the large sects ignored, including, for example, polygyny, which, as everyone knows, is expressly sanctioned in the "Old Testament" and not explicitly condemned in the "New." During the Puritan Revolution in England, the proponents of polygyny came fairly close to having a plurality of wives authorized by an act of the Parliament. In the same period, the Levellers included a faction, headed by Rainsborough, that advocated complete equality for all human beings, including women and, if he was logical, children and lunatics. It is noteworthy, however, that most of the Levellers, whether from conviction or political expediency, excluded from the blessings of equality all females, paupers, and servants—and, of course, all Royalists, Catholics, Anglicans, and other agents of Satan. See their official proclamations, collected and reprinted by G. E. Aylmer in *The Levellers in the English Revolution* (Cornell University Press, 1975).

80. The early Christians' mania for equality was most explicitly stated in gospels that were not included in the "New Testament" anthology when it was made up at the close of the Fourth Century. In my review of Mr. Simpson's *Which Way, Western Man?* (reprinted in *America's Decline*, pp. 355 ff.), I cited a gospel in which Jesus promises that, after he has raised hell on earth, he will resurrect all of his biped lambs and make them as indistinguishable from one another as the bees in a swarm. Other gospels do not go so far, but promise women that Jesus will make men of them, and some of the Fathers of the Church naturally invented miracles that proved that pious Christian females would have their sex changed so that they could enjoy life in an all-male Heaven.

which they had been derived.⁸¹

The professed anti-Christianity of the Revolution before Napoleon naturally suggested the great effort during the Nineteenth Century to quell the dark and clandestine forces of the enemies of our civilization by using Christianity as a backfire to contain the revolutionary conflagration. That often makes it difficult to determine how much of the professed faith of any individual was emotional conviction and how much was a sense of social expediency. When, for example, Thomas Arnold, who admittedly had been a sceptic in his young manhood, tried to inculcate in the boys at Rugby "a conviction of the truth of Christianity," how much of his piety was consciously or subconsciously motivated by a determination to make them immune to the murderous insanity that had swept France when he was a child?

As in the Counter-Reformation, the Christianity that men tried to restore was not what it had been before the upheaval. In both Catholic and Protestant countries it incorporated heresies taken from the Revolution, such as the condemnation of slavery as a social institution, and largely dropped the insistence on the divine source of political authority vested in a monarch and the aristocracy he or his predecessors had created. It would be vain to guess how successful the religious Restoration would have been, had not the cult been confronted by new augmentations of human knowledge.

The damage done to the faith by astronomy could not be repaired, but it had been glossed over and partly hidden by artful sophistries. But now men began to learn from primary sources the essential facts about other Oriental religions, and it soon became apparent that the Jews purloined almost all of their myths from the more civilized peoples of Asia, and that their religion was a vulgarized assortment of ideas taken from the same sources and perverted to justify the Jews' arrogant pretense to racial superiority. The alarmed holy men discovered that persecuting, mobbing, and imprisoning a courageously honest clergyman, the Reverend Mr. Taylor, whose *Diegesis* was

81. We should never forget that many Christian clergymen, both Catholic and Protestant, became disciples of the French Revolution, despite its strident hostility to the religion in which they were professionals. In the United States, for example, the Calvinists of the Edwardean Conspiracy immediately recognized the Revolution as "the Lord's work." They recognized in it, of course, the part of Christianity in which they were *really* interested. They moderated their enthusiasm when they perceived that it was detrimental to their scheme for obtaining political control of the new nation. I mention the Edwardeans in my article in *The Liberty Bell*, "The Uses of Religion," p. 10, note 2.

published in 1829,⁸² could not efface records that had been published and were known at least to scholars. At about the same time, primary sources began to yield a knowledge of the true history of Egypt and Babylon, and it gradually became more and more apparent that the tales in the "Old Testament," which had been thought to be an historical record checked and verified by an omniscient deity, were Jewish tales, comparable to the "true history" of Doon de Mayence or of Garin de Montglane in the French *chansons de geste*.⁸³ And finally biological science gave the *coup de grace* to the long cherished notion that human beings so differed from other mammals that they must have been especially designed by a well-meaning, but oddly inept, creator. What was more important, it became obvious that the Fathers of the Church, who fashioned the form of Christianity that came down to us, had incorporated in their religion the most advanced biological techniques for assuring

82. For a brief notice of Taylor and his work, see the article reprinted in *America's Decline*, pp. 357-360.

83. No one could read any Egyptian writing before 1821, and accurate knowledge of the several scripts and the language required the patient labors of many scholars for more than two generations, while knowledge of Egyptian history has been constantly augmented by the discovery and publication of inscriptions and papyri, which continues to the present time. The debunking of the Bible therefore proceeded slowly. For a long time, scholars, supposing there was some historical basis for the Jews' tales, tried to identify the King of Egypt who was called "Big House" (Pharaoh, i.e., the Palace) in the myths about Moses, which, as was eventually seen, was like trying to identify the king whose palace was enchanted by the fairy in the tale of the Sleeping Beauty.—The simplest form of the cuneiform script was first deciphered successfully by Rawlinson in 1846, thus making it possible to read inscriptions in Old Persian; on this basis, his successors read more complicated cuneiform writing and reconstructed the languages for which they were used, Susian, Babylonian, Akkadian, and Sumerian. At one time, even scholars tried to identify the king of Persia who had done something that gave rise to the story that he was so feeble-minded that he let the sexual talents of a Jewess induce him to permit God's People to massacre all the Aryans who didn't venerate them, but it has long since been obvious that the fiction and the Jewish festival that celebrates it annually were simply devised to inspire Jewesses to manipulate properly the stupid Aryan pigs whom they marry for the advancement of their holy race. Some educated Jews no longer try to pretend that their story book is historical, but take refuge in the claim that the myths embody a "God-given moral code." See the review of Magnus Magnusson's *B.C.: the Archaeology of the Bible* in the *Jewish Chronicle* (London), 25 March 1977. The same newspaper, however, has published a few letters from readers who demand legislation to forbid the accursed archaeologists and scholars from disclosing information detrimental to the prestige of Yahweh's Master Race and its God-given right to own the entire globe.

the degeneracy and eventual extinction of our race.⁸⁴

Thus, during the Nineteenth Century, Western Christianity was destroyed by two antithetical forces: its Scriptures could no longer be believed by educated and rational men, but at the same time they were read by ignorant, excitable, or malicious persons, who were inspired to revive the proletarian and baneful elements of primitive Christianity, which had been partly suppressed by the reaction against the French Revolution but reached their eventual fruition in the Bolshevism that the Jews imposed on Russia in 1918. The antithesis was total, but it was largely concealed by the phenomenon we have called the law of cultural residue. That made Milner's conspiracy possible.

The culture of the upper classes in Britain was compounded of brilliance and ambiguity. Women are far more prone to religiosity than men, but it is highly improbable that any lady in the elegant and apolaustic society that perished in 1914 actually believed that her sex had been created and cursed by a blundering god in the way described in what may be the silliest story in the whole Bible.⁸⁵ Some may have been convinced by

84. The facts of genetics are most concisely and lucidly set forth, without technicalities, by Mr. Simpson in Chapters XVI and XVII of *Which Way, Western Man?* See also the work of Professor Pendell cited in note 77 above. It was only to be expected that this biological science would excite a fanaticism even more vicious than did Copernican astronomy. It counters the tropism toward whatever is inferior, debased, and degenerate that is inherent in Christianity and appears, perhaps even most strongly, in its ostensibly irreligious sects, especially Communism and "Liberalism." The "educators" who now programme their "intellectual" zombies in the slums that once were universities are probably most concerned for the prosperity of their own racket, but some may have the religious faith of the "Liberals." The sleazy shysters who are working the "Moral Majority" swindle are our most recent affliction and could become the most pernicious.

85. There are, of course, two creation myths in the Bible. According to the first, the gods (the word is plural in Hebrew) took a whim to create human beings "in our image," and since the gods (like the gods whom we know the Jews worshipped at Elephantine before they decided to concentrate on Yahweh as their only patron among the gods) were of both sexes, they naturally created males and females, and told their creatures to start propagating their species. That straightforward story is as reasonable and believable as any creation myth. Christians, however, seem always to opt for the alternative tale, about Adam, Eve, the talking snake, and the Yahweh who makes a mess of everything he attempts and who goes walking under the trees in the cool of the evening to avoid the heat of the midday sun. It is likely that the absurd myth was suggested to some Jew by a common motif in genre-sculpture of the Hellenistic Age and perhaps earlier. A young girl gazes with longing at an apple hanging beyond her grasp on a tree about which is coiled a huge serpent. This pretty symbol of

the theologians' sophistries or overawed by the warning that "divine mysteries" are not to be thought about. Some doubtless felt free to form their own private opinions, and many probably refused to trouble their minds about theoretical questions irrelevant to their own lives. On occasion, one followed convention in religious matters, just as one conformed to the established etiquette in paying calls, leaving cards, issuing invitations, and arranging dinner parties.

Many men doubtless thought about religion as little as did their womenfolk, and were engrossed by the activities of their normally pleasant and carefree lives. Among thoughtful men, the dominant intellectual attitude was agnosticism, which was essentially a hesitation between deism and atheism, but could be extended to cover Christianity; it neatly eluded acrimonious debates, while permitting attendance at Christian ceremonies "to set an example for the lower classes."

The Church of England was the Establishment: it commanded respect and deserved support. It provided comfortable livings for educated gentlemen, often younger sons of the gentry, who would otherwise have been without an adequate income. Its clergy, with all the differences of rank and means that Trollope describes, were all products of the two great universities and they were, almost without exception, well-bred and urbane. It is unlikely that any one of them believed that a god had dictated the tales in the Bible, and we cannot measure the extent to which each man was intellectually satisfied by the sophistries of the theologians, but many, perhaps most, of them combined gentility with a deep moral earnestness. It would have been "bad form" indeed to disparage so cultivated and amiable a bulwark of society. Furthermore, educated men, almost without exception, took it for granted that the masses needed a religion—and they may well have been right. It followed, therefore, that Christianity, even in the vulgar form it took in the crude chapels of Dissenters, was a Good Thing. A gentleman would not take from the common folk their spiritual consolation any more than he would take away a little girl's doll. But the men who took that supercilious attitude were usually unaware of the beam in their own eye.

human longing for what is unattainable without suicidal risk would have been incomprehensible to a Jewish mind anyway. A good picture of one example of this decorative sculpture, coming from the third century B.C., may be found in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, XLIX (1945), pp. 430 ff. The preposterous tale about Adam, his spare rib (Eve, who became a mother before she became pregnant), and a hot-tempered god who obligingly became the world's first tailor, could have been believed only by persons who would not or could not reflect about what they heard or read.

Almost without exception, even atheists took it for granted that a monotheism was somehow better than a polytheism, and that Christianity had actually been an improvement over the "pagan" religions it displaced. It was regarded as the sole support of social and personal morality, and even as the source of the regulation of men's conduct toward their fellows in an organized society that had been earlier formulated in the laws of Hammurabi, the Code of Manu, and the unwritten principles to which Hesiod appealed. The British, having drastically revised the sexual preoccupations of the cult to suit themselves, were, like all stable societies, particularly concerned to preserve the family as a unit and to ensure the legitimacy of one's heirs. Western Christianity, having absorbed the chivalrous attitude toward women that is distinctively Aryan, was believed, not without justification, to have given women the privileged status that they have now repudiated together with their self-respect.

It was only natural, therefore, that Victorian agnostics shared Jefferson's esteem for the Jesus of the "New Testament." He may have been a Jewish reformer or even a frustrated revolutionary, but, if one politely overlooked his *gaffes*, one could see in him a morally earnest man whose better utterances were an exhortation to a conduct that was obviously desirable within a nation, and gave to the masses an ethical standard to which they could conform without reflection and doubt, believing it divinely ordained.

To this we must add the not inconsiderable effect of the position that Christianity had secured in the mythology by which a culture expands the scope of its language, supplementing its vocabulary with allusions to memorable stories that everyone knows. The Bible contains many Oriental tales as vivid as the stories of Aladdin and his lamp and of Sinbad the Sailor.⁸⁶ Everyone knows what we mean when we allude to Noah or Pharaoh or the Queen of Sheba or Jeremiah or Judas or Doubting Thomas or any one of scores of other stories, and the allusion supplies both a meaning and an emotional connotation that it would take pages of well-wrought

86. Incidentally, students of cultural history should perpend the fact that the "Arabian Nights" would never have attained any considerable popularity, had they been first disseminated in the accurate translations by Sir Richard Burton (17 vols., London, 1885-86) and Dr. J.C. Madrus (17 vols., Paris, 1926). For more than a century the stories were known only in the drastically simplified, condensed, and partly Westernized version by Antoine Galland, first published at Caen in 1704, and in English and German translations of Galland's French. Galland's version, which inspired the enormous vogue of pseudo-Oriental tales in the Eighteenth Century, is still the basis of the "Arabian Nights" that are read by the young.

prose to express otherwise. And we have charged those tales with a special significance: an allusion to Noah, for example, differs in its effects from an allusion to Deucalion, while an allusion to Utnapishtim or Manu would puzzle some readers, at least temporarily. Furthermore, the Biblical texts contain many memorable and expressive statements and apothegms, and their very words, forever enshrined for us in the English of the King James version, provide, like the plays of Shakespeare, apt verbal reminiscences that we use to augment our language—as, for example, I see that I did automatically in the last sentence of the third paragraph above. To speak of a beam in one's eye is physiologically absurd, but the allusion has a clear meaning. Christianity, for better or worse, has become an integral part of our culture, and it has, moreover, enriched our literature with the true gospels of Western Christianity, from *Paradise Lost* to the *Idylls of the King*.

We must remember also that Western Christianity incorporated our race's instinctive compassion and charity for the unfortunate, which is socially advantageous when it conduces to the preservation of our own people, and does not become a deadly poison until it is madly perverted to a device for degrading us to benefit our enemies. This sentiment of practical charity appears most strongly in the Nordic, perhaps in the Anglo-Saxon, part of our race.⁸⁷ Few today appreciate the fact that with the Poor Law of 1601 the English began to tax themselves for the support of the poor, and that by the time of Charles II fully one-third of the total revenue raised by taxation was devoted to that eleemosynary work of national and local governments. That concern for one's people, although unenlightened by the biological discrimination that is requisite for national survival, evinces a sound instinct that was later perverted into an unthinking and pernicious sentimentality.

When we try to reconstruct in our minds the atmosphere of the great Victorian Age, we must also take into account the underlying tensions of a time when every crime of fraud or violence was reasonably attributed to a "neglect of religion and

87. In my youth, I observed an especially instructive manifestation of the altruistic factor in our racial psyche. In the late 1930s, when small farmers were under increasing economic pressure, a middle-aged man, who had taught English literature and then held a very responsible position in the administration of a large university, suffered a "nervous breakdown." Abandoning his office and family, he began to roam the countryside, trying to help farmers who seemed particularly distressed. He, for example, bought calves that he presented to farmers who, he thought, ought to raise some livestock, and he even contributed his own labor. He was killed when he fell from the ridgepole of a barn on which he was putting a new roof.

morality," the two being considered synonymous, while the religion was becoming unbelievable. It was socially terrifying as well as personally painful to live in a world laid bare by the dissipation of pleasant illusions:

No hope in this worn-out world, no hope beyond the tomb;

No living and loving God, but only blind and stony Doom.

When the veil of fiction was rent, man shuddered before "Nature, red in tooth and claw." Nature had always been that and always will be, and the hands of man, even when he fashions and defends the noblest civilization, must forever be bloody hands, for this is a world in which only the strong and resolute nations survive, while the weak, especially the morally weak, who babble about brotherhood and peace, are biologically degenerate and doomed to extinction.

From this affrighting glimpse of reality, the Victorian mind recoiled and often sought refuge in frantic affirmations of impossible anodynes. Tennyson was one of the great poets of that age, but he could write such stuff as

Put down the passions that make earth Hell!
Down with ambition, avarice, pride,
Jealousy, down! Cut off from the mind
The bitter springs of anger and fear;

and so on. He could have expressed his message more concisely: Let's stop breathing! Such tirades, however, were tolerable in an age in which thoughtful men had to find, even for themselves, some socially feasible path between the brilliantly cynical hedonism of Oscar Wilde's *Picture of Dorian Gray* and the lethal pessimism that James Thomson ("Bysshe Vanolis") made sonorous in *The City of the Dreadful Night*.

One escape from reality was by drugging oneself with visions of Jesus's New Earth, slightly modernized by deleting the celestial protagonist and replacing him with a vaporous notion of social Progress that was absurdly thought to be confirmed by the actual progress of scientific knowledge and technological skill. Tennyson, whom we cite precisely because he was so great a representative of his age, should never have gone to Locksley Hall, where, in a fit of midsummer madness, he "dipt into the future, as far as human eye could see," and beheld such phantasmagoria as a time when

the war-drum thröbb'd no longer, and the battle flags were
furl'd

In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.

When he wrote, Tennyson probably said, Get thee behind me,

Jesus. That was probably why he didn't see who was whispering in his ear.

What is insidious in Tennyson's poem and all the tons of printed paper that dilate on the couplet I quoted, is that an accurate prevision of aërial transportation and warfare between "airy navies" lent a meretricious sheen of plausibility to a Christian fantasy that had been made only the more preposterous by superficial changes. Christianity, expelled from the door, stole back through the window, unnoticed and unsuspected.

Fantasies about magical transformations of the human species are pleasing in themselves, and a first-rate poet or rhetorician can make them alluring and even credible with literary charm. We may treat them, when reading, with "poetic suspension of doubt," and hesitate to break the illusion. When we read of Britomart in the *Faërie Queen* or of Bradamante in the *Orlando*, we are entranced by the dreamworld in which those doughty female warriors appear, and we feel mean and churlish, if we let reality intrude and destroy the romance with an observation that the hero who marries such a virago is much to be pitied. World peace is far more unnatural and fantastic than a charming female whose brawny arm can unhorse and slay valiant knights and can cope with giants, but we don't like to laugh at such alluring wisps of the imagination. And they do give us a mental escape from a reality that may daunt the most courageous—although it must be faced in the end, unless we as a people opt for the content of a male spider, who presumably enjoys his dalliance with the female before she eats him.

I have tried to suggest the multiple factors that, in the Victorian Era, made it possible for men who thought they had escaped from Christianity to be only the more enthralled by the *worst* aspects of it. They were trapped by what I have called the law of cultural residue. The Oriental religion, as revised and partly acclimated by our racial psyche, had induced certain pleasing, though ultimately enervating, dreams of a felicity impossible in this world and prudently promised only in an invisible world, above the clouds or beyond the moon, in which all of the laws of nature would be repealed and all good ghosts would be equal and happy. That world, however, was the responsibility of the omnipotent three-in-one tyrant who managed everything, and the important thing for men, during their brief sojourn in this sublunar world, was to make sure they were obeying a duly authorized holy man who knew the magic rites that gave ghosts admittance to his transmundane and transfinite realm.

When the supernatural authority for dulcet dreams of future felicity evaporated, many human beings clung only the more

desperately to their dreams and wanted to realize them in the only world they would ever know. Jesus went off stage, changed his nightgown for a dinner jacket, and came back as Progress. The new biological science was travestied by an uncommonly foolish equivocation, "some call it Evolution and some call it God." And Progress, appearing in his new togs as the Saviour sent by Science, marketed the old apocalyptic hokum about a Heaven on Earth, laying on his True Believers the urgent duty to create that One World at once, according to the plans of a divine architect who, unfortunately, wasn't there anymore. And every shyster and con man, every misfit filled with organic resentment of his betters, grasped the opportunity to prey upon residual superstition and excite in impressionable minds a feeling of guilt because they had not done what men cannot do.

The Victorians, remember, thought themselves rich and secure in the power their fathers had won for them with blood. They could enjoy their civilization rather than defend and augment it; they could afford to indulge themselves in sprees of idealism. And it is only fair to add that not even in their worst nightmares could they have foreseen the consequences of their sentimental debauchery: their wealth and power lost and their once sceptered isle overrun with anthropoid vermin that swarmed out of the ruins of their empire. Had the Victorians foreseen the England of today, they would have had the prudence and manhood to make that catastrophe impossible, even at the cost of a vigorous reaffirmation of the qualities that had made them great—and of a social surgery that would have been an inspiring precedent for all of our race or, at least, the viable parts of it. As it was, in the cozy relaxation of their ephemeral prosperity and the bewilderment of a cultural residue, they permitted themselves to be manipulated and led to disaster by the artful intrigues of the simple-minded crackpots of Milner's conspiracy.

There were other factors, of course, but Quigley's posthumous book makes it clear, I think, that the crucial and decisive factor was the willingness of the British, bemused by our race's long addiction to Christianity, to tolerate the open and clandestine activities of the Milner Group. They should have known better, but they did not. The English were like persons who give boxes of matches to unruly moppets and tell them to go play in the attic. They should not have been surprised by the consequences. The Jews were not.

At all events, there has, I hope, been some profit for us in a somewhat detailed review of the operations of the collective calamity that Rhodes founded—with the best of intentions. And the most frightening thing of all may be the apparent certainty

that the direly destructive pack of highly educated dunderheads also meant well. Their minds secluded from reality by a shimmering curtain of abstract ideas and travailed by residual superstition, they never suspected they were only sheepdogs in the service of malevolent herdsmen. They believed themselves to be, and indeed by birth and education they largely were, the élite of an élite.

It will be a long time before I can hear the word 'élite' without a shudder.